ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 6/14/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER ED000008
2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S). 7346
3. IDENTIFICATION NO. N.A.
4. AUTHOR(S): Russell, John Dale
5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: Control and Coordination of Higher Education in Michigan - Staff Study No. 12, The Survey of Higher Education in Michigan
6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.
7. EDITOR(S): N.A.
8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG.
ST.
CITY, STATE
TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE
9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education
10. VOL.
11. PAGES
12. MO./YR. 58
13. TOTAL PP. 91

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA
15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR survey

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

surveys	management			
administration				
government				

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The five chapters in this study deal with present controls over public higher education in Michigan; the necessity for statewide coordination of higher education; principles of coordination and control; State plans for coordination of higher education; and a plan for the coordination of State-controlled higher education in Michigan. Recommendations are made at appropriate places throughout the text and are recapitulated in the final chapter. The report was made by Dr. Russell for the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education and the Citizens Advisory Committee.

E.. No.
18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION
20. DIVISION OR DEPT.
21. CONTRACT NO.
PROJECT NO.
22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT
23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health,
Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

CONTROL AND COORDINATION
OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN

by

John Dale Russell
Director of the Survey

Staff Study No. 12

The Survey of Higher Education in Michigan

Prepared for the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education
P.O. Box 240, State Capitol, Lansing, Michigan

July 1958

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Publications Issued (to July, 1958) in

THE SURVEY OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN

Preliminary Report to the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, by John Dale Russell, March, 1957

Staff Study No. 1, The Community College in Michigan, by S. V. Martorana, June, 1957

Staff Study No. 2, Geographic Origins of Michigan College Students, by John Dale Russell and Orvin T. Richardson, August, 1957

Staff Study No. 3, Education in Medicine and Nursing in Michigan, by Dr. W. T. Sanger, December, 1957

Staff Study No. 4, Physical Plant Needs in the State-controlled Institutions of Higher Education in Michigan, by Earl W. Anderson and Elden B. Sessions, January, 1958

Staff Study No. 5, Student Personnel Services in the Publicly Controlled Colleges and Universities in Michigan, by Orvin T. Richardson, February, 1958

Staff Study No. 6, Instructional Programs in Michigan Institutions of Higher Education, by John Dale Russell, John X. Jamrich, and Orvin T. Richardson, March, 1958

Staff Study No. 7, Extension and Field Services in the State-controlled Colleges and Universities in Michigan, by Julius M. Nolte and Robert Bell Browne, April, 1958

Staff Study No. 8, Financial Assistance to Students in Michigan Institutions of Higher Education, by John X. Jamrich, May, 1958

Staff Study No. 9, Space Utilization and Value of Physical Plants in Michigan Institutions of Higher Education, by John Dale Russell and John X. Jamrich, June, 1958

Staff Study No. 10, Faculties of the Michigan Institutions of Higher Education, by John X. Jamrich, June, 1958

Staff Study No. 11, Institutional Planning for Higher Education in Michigan, by John Dale Russell, July, 1958

Staff Study No. 12, Control and Coordination of Higher Education in Michigan, by John Dale Russell, July, 1958

The reports named above complete the list of Staff Studies to be published in the Survey Series. The Final Report of the Survey of Higher Education in Michigan will be published in the fall of 1958. Copies of the publications listed above, and also of the Final Report of the Survey, may be obtained, subject to the availability of the supply, on request from the office of the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, P.O. Box 240 (fourth floor, State Capitol), Lansing, Michigan.

MEMBERS OF THE MICHIGAN LEGISLATIVE STUDY COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Senators:

Frank Andrews

Frank D. Beadle

Patrick J. Doyle

Clyde H. Geerlings, Vice Chairman

Edward Hutchinson

Representatives:

Charles A. Boyer, Chairman

Arnell Engstrom

Allison Green

John J. Penczak

Frank D. Williams

MEMBERS OF THE CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

George W. Dean, President, Michigan Federation of Labor, Lansing

S. D. Den Uyl, President, Bohn Aluminum and Brass Corporation, Detroit

Merritt D. Hill, General Manager, Tractor and Implement Division, Ford Motor Company, Birmingham

Benjamin Levinson, President, Franklin Mortgage Corporation, Detroit

W. D. Merrifield, Director of Industrial Education, Chrysler Corporation, Detroit

Stephen S. Nisbet, Vice President -- Public Relations, Gerber Products Company, Fremont

Stanley M. Powell, Legislative Counsel, Michigan Farm Bureau, Ionia

Don Stevens, Education Director, Michigan C.I.O. Council, Grand Rapids

Robert L. Taylor, Secretary-Treasurer, State Mutual Cyclone Insurance Company, Lapeer

Don Vander Werp, former State Senator, Fremont

James M. VerMeulen, President, American Seating Company, Grand Rapids

FOREWORD

Explicit instructions were given in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 30 of the 1955 Legislature, by which the present Survey of Higher Education in Michigan was authorized, to the effect that attention must be given to "the most desirable means for achieving effective and coordinated effort on the part of the institutions in meeting present and future needs." This problem is one that is being faced in many other States, as well as in Michigan. As the work of the Survey of Higher Education in Michigan progressed, it became increasingly clear that the problem of the coordination of the State's efforts in higher education is a paramount issue in the whole future development of the educational service of the State.

The purpose of the present study is to review and analyze the plans now in effect in the publicly controlled institutions of higher education in Michigan for control at the board level and on a State-wide basis, and to make recommendations for improvement of those plans. The study has been based on first-hand observation in Michigan by the Director of the Survey, on analyses of the Constitution and statutes of Michigan governing the institutions of higher education, on extensive conferences with interested citizens throughout the State, and on information regarding the plans for the control and coordination of higher education in other States. The recommendations growing out of the study are made at the appropriate places through the text of the first five chapters, and are recapitulated for convenience in the final chapter of this report.

The author of Staff Study No. 12, Dr. John Dale Russell, is Director of the Survey of Higher Education in Michigan. At the time of his appointment to this responsibility, he was serving as Chancellor and Executive Secretary of the Board of Educational Finance of the State of New Mexico. His direction of the Survey of Higher Education in Michigan has been on a part-time basis, while continuing to hold his position in New Mexico. On April 1, 1958, he became Director of Institutional Research and Director of the Center for the Study and Development of Higher Education at New York University in New York City, from which location he has continued his work in the direction of the Survey of Higher Education in Michigan on a part-time basis.

The points of view expressed by the author in Staff Study No. 12 have been developed out of extended experience with the problems of the control and coordination of higher education. The author for the past six years has been the chief executive of the State-wide coordinating board for higher education in New Mexico. He has also been a member of the Conference of Executive Officers of State-wide Boards of Higher Education, and has regularly attended the meetings of that group. The Conference consists of representatives from some fourteen States having a single central coordinating agency for higher education with an executive officer in charge. The annual meetings of this group are attended by men who have had broad experience with the actual operation of State-wide coordinating systems; practically all the men in the country who have had such experience have participated in the meetings. The programs of the Conference are devoted to discussions of problems of operating State-wide coordinating agencies for higher education.

In addition to the association with the Conference of Executive Officers of State-wide Boards of Higher Education, the author of Staff Study No. 12 has had the benefit of numerous conferences with Dr. Lyman Glenny, of the Sacramento State College in California. Dr. Glenny, under a grant from an endowed foundation, has, during the past two or three years, been making a study of all the plans found in the various States for the coordination of higher education. It had been hoped by the author of Staff Study No. 12 that the findings of Dr. Glenny's study would be published before the preparation of the present report for Michigan was completed. The preparation of Staff Study No. 12 has been delayed, so that it has become the final one in the Survey Series, in the hope that the author might have opportunity in it to make specific reference to the published report of Dr. Glenny's study. That report, however, has not yet been available at the time of writing Staff Study No. 12, and so it cannot be referred to specifically in the text. The author of Staff Study No. 12 has had opportunity to scan a preliminary draft of Dr. Glenny's report, but no attempt has been made to discover points of agreement and disagreement between the final edition of that report and Staff Study No. 12.

As in the case of all other publications of the Survey of Higher Education in Michigan, the author of Staff Study No. 12 is solely responsible for the findings and conclusions and the full text of the study. The report is made for the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education and the Citizens Advisory Committee, but this does not imply any endorsement by the Committees of the findings and recommendations. The publication of this report is in accordance with the general terms of the arrangements for the Survey, which provide that the Director of the Survey shall have full authority to decide what shall be published as Staff Studies and as his report to the Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education.

Staff Study No. 12 is presented with the hope that it will assist the Legislature and other State officials, the institutions of higher education, and the people of Michigan, in solving what is perhaps the most immediately pressing problem facing them in the management of the State's efforts in higher education.

John Dale Russell
Director of the Survey

July 1958

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Foreword iv

CHAPTER

I. PRESENT CONTROLS OVER PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN. . . . 1
  Boards for State-controlled Institutions. 5
    Selection of Board Members 6
    Number of Members on Board 11
    Length of Term of Board Members. 13
    Geographical Limitations of Board Membership 17
    Presiding Officers 18
  The Community College Boards. 19
  The Present Lack of Coordination. 21
II. THE NECESSITY FOR STATE-WIDE COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION. . 27
III. PRINCIPLES OF COORDINATION AND CONTROL 41
IV. STATE PLANS FOR THE COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION 54
V. A PLAN FOR THE COORDINATION OF STATE-CONTROLLED HIGHER EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN. 61
  A Separate Board for Each Institution 63
  Constitutional Boards for All Institutions. 67
  Creation of a Coordinating Board. 68
    Functions of the Coordinating Board. 68

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER Page

V. (continued)

Membership of the Coordinating Board 73

Staff for the Coordinating Board 77

Financing the Coordinating Board 79

State Control over Community Colleges 81

Supervision and Accreditation of High Schools 85

VI. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS 89

CHAPTER I

PRESENT CONTROLS OVER PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN

In the United States the almost universal practice is to lodge control over each institution of higher education in a board, variously known as the board of regents, board of trustees, board of directors, or board of governors. The function of the board is to represent the constituency that maintains the institution and to make final decisions on all policies of operation and management. The controlling board of a college or university is generally composed of outstanding people who are not connected with the institution in any other capacity.

The colleges and universities maintained under the auspices of the Roman Catholic Church constitute an exception to the general rule of having as board members only people who are not connected with the institution. In a Catholic institution the board usually consists of a few staff members organized only for the property-holding purposes, while the control is lodged in the religious order or the ecclesiastical hierarchy. A Catholic college or university generally has an advisory board which, though without official power, serves much the same function of keeping the institution closely in touch with the constituency as is served by the controlling board of other types of institutions.

The American pattern of control of institutions of higher education through boards of regents or trustees is different from the plan of control over similar institutions elsewhere in the world. In most other countries the final control is almost never vested in a "lay" board, but rather is lodged in the faculty, or in the student body, or in some governmental bureau such as a ministry of education.

The control over institutions of higher education in the United States is somewhat similar to the control over many other functions of government in which expert professional service is rendered. It is a familiar pattern in this country to have a board, whose members are not on the salaried staff, in charge of such governmental operations as the local public schools, State highways, licensing of practitioners for various professions, or library services.

Institutions of higher education in the United States are commonly grouped into two broad categories, in accordance with the nature of the board by which they are controlled. An institution controlled by a board a majority of whose members obtain their office through some sort of governmental action, such as election by the people or appointment by the governor, mayor, or other official of government, is classified as "publicly controlled." If a majority of the members of the board of a college or university obtain their offices through action by some non-governmental agency, such as a church body, an alumni group, or the existing members of the board, (co-optation), the institution is classified as "privately controlled." Throughout this Survey of higher education in Michigan this distinction between the two major classes of educational institutions has been observed.

The publicly controlled institutions may be further subdivided on the basis of whether the selection of board members is a State or local function. If a majority of the members of the board obtain their office through appointment or election by some action of State government, such as appointment by the Governor or election on a State-wide basis, the institution is classified as "State-controlled." In other institutions a majority of the board members obtain their office through action by some local agency or electorate. In Michigan, institutions of this type are known as "community colleges " (or in the older terminology, "junior colleges").

Throughout this Survey of Higher Education in Michigan the three major categories that have been used in classifying institutions are the State-controlled, the privately controlled, and the community colleges. The basic distinction in these categories of institutions lies in the manner in which the members of the controlling board obtain their offices.

Institutions of higher education, not only in the United States but all over the world, are characterized by a high degree of local autonomy in the management of their operations. This is quite contrary to the situation in the management of other levels of education. Each elementary or secondary school is considered to be part of a "system," and most of the operating control is lodged, not within the individual school unit, but in the central authorities of the district maintaining the school. A city school system usually has several elementary schools, and the larger cities have more than one high school, but each elementary school and each high school in the system is under the general control of the board of education for the entire district, and a large part of the operating authority is lodged in a central office of the superintendent of schools. By contrast, each institution of higher education generally has its own board of control, and even when two or more colleges or universities are under the control of a single board, each institution typically has its own president and is given a very large degree of autonomy in the management of its own affairs. Institutional autonomy is jealously guarded by a college or university, and encroachments on it are, as a rule, resisted vigorously.

Although the controlling board of a college or university normally has final jurisdiction over operating policies and the selection of personnel, in good practice the board delegates the actual management of the institution to the faculty and administrative staff. Particularly in matters affecting the curriculum, instruction, and research, the board generally leaves the final control in the hands of the faculty and its executive officers. The members of the board are usually educational "laymen" and cannot be expected to have the sound judgment that the faculty and executive staff members have on strictly professional matters. The distinction between functions that belong to the board and those that should wisely be delegated to the faculty and administrative staff is by no means clear-cut in every case. In any event the board itself must take the final responsibility, even though it may delegate near final authority to the faculty and staff on many important matters.

The controlling board exercises a function that, in the main, can be described as legislative, rather than executive. That is, the principal responsibility of the Board is to decide broad policies affecting the services of the institution, rather than to handle the specific application of those policies in individual situations as they arise in the day-to-day management of the college or university. In making decisions about policies, the board acts as a representative of the constituency that maintains the institution. In the democratic theory of government, the board represents and reflects the will of the people of the constituency by which and for which the institution is maintained. The responsibility of the board member is great, for he must be concerned both with the welfare of the institution and with the best possible service to the people for whom it is maintained, consistent with the ability to obtain the necessary financial support.

The present chapter is devoted to an analysis of the pattern of board by which the publicly controlled institutions of higher education in Michigan are operated. The principal attention is given to the boards of the State-controlled colleges and universities, inasmuch as these are the institutions with which the Legislature must deal directly. A limited description of the nature of the boards controlling the community colleges in Michigan is presented, but a study of the boards of the privately controlled institutions is outside the purview of the present survey.

Boards for State-controlled Institutions[1]

Six different boards are provided for the nine State-controlled institutions of higher education in Michigan. The titles of these boards, and the institutions under each, are as follows:

The Regents of the University of Michigan;
The State Board of Agriculture, for Michigan State University;
The Board of Governors of Wayne State University;
The Board of Control of Michigan College of Mining and Technology;
The Board of Control for Ferris Institute;
The State Board of Education, for Central Michigan College, Eastern Michigan College, Northern Michigan College, and Western Michigan University.

Three of the boards controlling State institutions in Michigan are established by the State Constitution (Article XI) -- the Regents of the University (of Michigan), the State Board of Agriculture (for Michigan State University), and the State Board of Education ("for the state normal college and the state normal schools" -- now Eastern Michigan College, Central Michigan College, Northern Michigan College, and Western Michigan University). The Board of Governors of Wayne State University, the Board of Control for Ferris Institute, and the Board of Control of Michigan College of Mining and Technology, are each established by a separate statute.

---

[1] This topic was treated in the Preliminary Report to the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education. (Published by the Committee, State Capitol, Lansing, Michigan. March, 1957.)

The Constitution gives somewhat more authority to the Regents of the University of Michigan and to the State Board of Agriculture for Michigan State University, than it gives to the State Board of Education for the institutions under that Board. For the University of Michigan the Constitution provides (Article XI Section 5) that "the board of regents shall have the general supervision of the university and control of all expenditures from university funds." For Michigan State University the Constitution provides (Article XI Section 8) that "the board shall have the supervision of the college (now Michigan State University) and the direction and control of all agricultural college funds." For the four institutions under the State Board of Education the Constitution provides (Article XI Section 6) only that "the state board of education shall have general supervision of the state normal college and the state normal schools, and the duties of the said board shall be prescribed by law." No provision is made in the Constitution for "direction and control of all expenditures" by the State Board of Education, similar to the provision of authority for the Board of Regents of the University of Michigan and the State Board of Agriculture. The inclusion of the clause concerning control over funds and expenditures has made an important difference in the extent to which the University of Michigan and Michigan State University are subject to regulation by the Legislature and the State fiscal authorities, as compared with the other State-controlled institutions in Michigan for which the Constitution and statutes reserve no such rights to the respective boards of control.

Selection of Board Members

In the State-controlled institutions of higher education in Michigan two major methods are followed in the selection of voting members of the six boards. The members of the boards for two of the institutions, Michigan College of Mining and

and Technology and Ferris Institute, are appointed by the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. This method is also being used for certain appointees to the temporary board of Wayne State University while it is in transition from its former status as a municipal institution to a State university, but this plan will be terminated in 1959.

The board members for all other State-controlled institutions in Michigan are elected by popular vote on a State-wide basis. This method will also be used for the selection of Board members for Wayne State University beginning in 1959. At the biennial spring election in April of each odd-numbered year, two members are elected to the Regents of the University of Michigan, two to the State Board of Agriculture (for Michigan State University), and one to the State Board of Education (for Central Michigan College, Eastern Michigan College, Northern Michigan College, and Western Michigan University). The State Superintendent of Public Instruction, who is ex officio a voting member of the State Board of Education, is elected for a two-year term at each biennial spring election in April. In April, 1959, all members of the Board of Governors of Wayne State University are to be elected at the biennial spring election, and thereafter two are to be elected at each subsequent biennial spring election. All board members for these State-controlled institutions make the race in the biennial spring elections on a political party ticket. Nominations are made by each political party in their State conventions. The plan of holding the elections in April, rather than in November, tends to minimize the national and State political issues in the voters' choices of members for the controlling boards of the State institutions.

Further explanation should be given about the method by which the Board of Governors of Wayne State University is being chosen during the interim period of transition to full State control. During this period the University is under the control of a Board of eleven members, of whom seven were originally the members of the Board of Education of the City of Detroit, one was selected by the Board of Regents (of the University of Michigan) from its membership, one was selected by the State Board of Agriculture from its membership, one was selected by the State Board of Education from its membership, and one was appointed by the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. As memberships expire on the Detroit Board of Education, their successors on the Board of Governors of the University are appointed by the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate (Public Acts of 1956, No. 183).

The two contrasting methods of selecting board members, election on a party ballot and appointment by the Governor, apparently arose at different times in Michigan. The earlier method seems to be that of election on a party ballot. As previously noted, this method is embedded in the Constitution in the case of three of the six boards. Appointment by the Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, has been employed only in the case of institutions whose boards were set up by statute. It is interesting to note, however, that the most recent statute, that providing for the Board of Governors of Wayne State University in 1959 and thereafter, reverts to the older method of election on a party ballot.

A review of the experience in the State of Michigan yields no evidence that one method of selecting board members is consistently superior to the other. Both methods have resulted in the choice of board members who have rendered excellent service to the State and its educational institutions. In general, modern political theory leans to the method of appointment as being more desirable than the method of election on a party ballot. The argument is that many citizens who would render outstanding service as members of a college or university board have not identified themselves sufficiently closely with the activities of one of the major political parties to win the necessary nomination in the State convention prior to being placed on the ballot. Such citizens can readily be considered by the Governor in making appointments to boards, and they are likely to win confirmation by the Senate without regard to party affiliation.

So far as could be determined in this Survey, the maintenance of two different plans of selecting board members for the State-controlled institutions of higher education is not causing any particular difficulty in Michigan. While the problem is not urgent, in the interests of uniformity it would seem desirable to settle on some one plan for the selection of Board members for all the State-controlled institutions of higher education. It is recommended that, if and when a convention is called for a general revision of the State Constitution, consideration be given to revising the method of selecting board members for the State-controlled institutions so that all will be appointed by the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

In some States a third method of selecting board members of educational institutions is followed, that of ex officio membership. That is, because of holding some other office, the person is automatically a member of the board. This practice is followed in Michigan in only one case, so far as voting membership on an institutional board is concerned. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction is ex officio a member of the State Board of Education. In general, it is considered undesirable to have the voting members of educational boards selected on an ex officio basis. The voting members of a board should be chosen for their qualifications as board members, not because of some other office they may happen to hold.

The provision, by which the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in Michigan is ex officio a member of the board controlling the four institutions that were originally normal schools, must be questioned as contrary to good practice. Furthermore, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction is also the executive officer of the State Board of Education, and it is usually unwise for the executive officer of a board to be one of its voting members. It is recommended that, if and when a convention is called for a general revision of the State Constitution, consideration be given to the elimination of ex officio membership by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction on any board that controls a State college or university. This recommendation should not in any way be construed as a reflection on the capability or services of any one who has held the office of State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Instead the recommendation is based on principles of administration generally considered sound in the management of colleges and universities.

In addition to his voting membership on the State Board of Education, the Constitution (Article XI Section 2) provides that the State Superintendent of Public Instruction "shall be ex officio a member of all other boards having control of public instruction in any state institution, with the right to speak but not to vote." The statutes providing for the organization of three of the boards, those for Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Ferris Institute, and Wayne State University, do not specifically mention the State Superintendent of Public Instruction as an ex officio member of the respective boards. The catalogs of the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, and Ferris Institute, and also the Michigan Manual, list the State Superintendent of Public Instruction as an ex officio member of the respective boards of control for these institutions. The latest publications from Wayne State University also list the State Superintendent of Public Instruction as an ex officio member of the Board of Governors. The State Superintendent of Public

Instruction does not appear in the similar listings of the members of the Board of Control of the Michigan College of Mining and Technology. At the University of Michigan and also at Michigan State University, the president of the institution is designated by the State Constitution as an ex officio member of the governing board "with the privilege of speaking but not of voting."

Ex officio membership on the controlling board of a college or university, without voting privileges, is largely window-dressing and serves no real purpose. If the right to attend board meetings and to speak on any subject before the board is to be accorded to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, that could be done by statute without designating him as an ex officio member. In the same way it would seem unnecessary to have a constitutional provision for ex officio membership by the university president on the controlling board of his institution in order to guarantee him the right to speak at board meetings. It is recommended that, if and when a convention is called for a general revision of the State Constitution, consideration be given to the elimination of all provisions for ex officio non-voting members of the controlling boards of the institutions of higher education.

Number of Members on Boards

The number of members on the boards for the State-controlled colleges and universities of Michigan varies from a low of four, for the State Board of Education, to a high of eight, for the Regents of the University of Michigan and the Board of Control for Ferris Institute. The State Board of Agriculture, the Board of Control of Michigan College of Mining and Technology, and the Board of Governors of Wayne State University (after 1959) have six members each. In addition, as has been noted previously, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction is ex officio a member, without vote, on each of the five boards of other than the State Board of Education, and the presidents of the University of Michigan and Michigan State University hold membership, ex officio, on the controlling boards of their respective institutions.

Long experience in the American system of institutional control by boards indicates that a membership of from five to nine persons results in good procedure. With a number of members larger than nine, the board becomes unwieldy, and with a smaller number than five members the board is usually not adequately representative of the constituency. All the boards of the State-controlled institutions in Michigan fall within the acceptable range except the State Board of Education. Although the State Board of Education has long operated with only four members, question may be raised as to whether the number should not be increased, if this Board is to continue to be in control of four institutions that have now grown to have large enrollments. At present, if two of the four members are absent from a meeting, a quorum is lacking and business cannot be transacted. By custom one of the members has traditionally been chosen from the Upper Peninsula, so that the representation from this section of the State is 25 per cent of the membership of the Board, although the area has less than 5 per cent of the State's population. The solution that might well be considered, if the State Board of Education is to remain in control of the four institutions, is to increase its membership to six. This would require an amendment of the State Constitution. An effort to amend the Constitution to make this provision is not recommended, except as the whole question of the control of the four State institutions now under the State Board of Education may come under consideration in a convention for the general revision of the Constitution.

The Michigan boards are unusual also in that all of them have an even number of members -- four, six, and eight. The common practice in other States is to set up boards with an odd number of members -- five, seven, or nine -- so that tie votes are not likely to occur. The point is not an important one. If opinions are so evenly divided that a tie vote results, it is often better not to take action until a more nearly unanimous agreement is reached. Even though the provision is made for an odd number of members on the board, absences from meetings may still make a tie vote possible. The plan of having an even number of members on the board makes it possible to elect the same number of new members at each biennial election, which is a point in favor of the present practice. If a change were to be made to the appointive method of selecting board members, it might be desirable to arrange for the expiration of one membership each year, instead of two every two years, and thus an odd number of board members could be provided while retaining the advantages of the staggered expiration of terms.

Length of Term of Board Members

The length of term of members of the institutional boards of higher education in Michigan tends to be closely associated with the number of members on the board (in each case except the State Board of Education), thus insuring continuity of policy. The two boards that have eight members -- the University of Michigan and Ferris Institute -- have eight-year terms, with two terms expiring every other year. Each of the three boards with six members (including Wayne State University after 1959) has six-year terms for its members, again with two terms expiring every other year. Three of the four members of the State Board of Education are elected for six-year terms, one being elected every other year. The fourth member of the State Board of Education, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, is elected for a two-year term, in the same year one other member of that Board is elected.

In general, the provisions for length of term of board members in the Michigan institutions of higher education are excellent and deserve commendation. Six years is the minimum length of term considered satisfactory, for it takes a couple of years, as a rule, for a new board member to become sufficiently familiar with the problems of the institution so that his counsel on matters coming before the board is valuable. A term much longer than eight or nine years is likely to interfere with the necessary flexibility in infusing new ideas and new points of view at the highest level of institutional control.

The only situation on which criticism may be made of the present arrangement for length of terms of board members in Michigan is in the case of the ex officio membership of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction on the State Board of Education. This key public official is elected for only a two year term, and thus this membership on the State Board of Education may expire at the end of any two-year period. In the past the voters of Michigan have tended to re-elect the incumbent State Superintendent of Public Instruction, so that there has actually been reasonably good continuity in this office. But the constitutional provision for biennial election of this official does not provide for the length of term of service that is desirable for a member of a board controlling a college or university. The solution to this problem seems to be the discontinuance of the ex officio membership of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction on any board for a State-controlled institution of higher education, as recommended previously.

All the boards of the State-controlled institutions of higher education in Michigan have provision for the appointment or election of members for overlapping terms. Two memberships on each board (one, in the case of the State Board of Education) expire every two years. This is a very desirable provision, for it assures that, in all the boards except one, a majority of the members in office at any one time will normally have had at least two years of experience in that office. The one exception is the State Board of Education. It is possible for one-half of that Board to be composed of new members at one time, in case a new Superintendent of

Public Instruction is elected in a year when another new member is elected to the Board. This occurred in 1953 and again in 1957. The recommendation that has previously been made, for the elimination of the membership of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction from the State Board of Education, and the change in the number of members of the State Board of Education from four to six, as previously suggested, would correct the difficulty now apparent in the lack of provision for assurance that two-thirds of the members of the State Board of Education will always have had at least two years of experience in that position.

In addition to the legal length of term of board members, consideration must be given to the actual length of tenure of the members at present in service. Wayne State University must be left out of this discussion for its Board of Governors is in transition to the new status, which will go into effect, with all members of the Board newly elected, in 1959. In the other five boards, the median length of service of members in office in June, 1958, ranged from a low of three years for the State Board of Education and the State Board of Agriculture (for Michigan State University), to a high of eight years at Ferris Institute. The median represents the point, in years of service, at which half the members have had a larger and half have had a smaller number of years on the board. The median length of service for the Regents of the University of Michigan was five years. For the members of the Board of Control of Michigan College of Mining and Technology the median length of service was six years. At Ferris Institute seven of the eight board members in June, 1958, had served ever since the Institute was taken over by the State and the first board appointed in 1950; the eighth member, recently deceased, had also served on the board for Ferris Institute since 1950. The State Board of Agriculture (for Michigan State University) had one member serving in June, 1958, with thirty-seven years of continuous service on that board -- by far the longest period of membership for any one on any of the Michigan boards for institutions of higher education. The State Board of Education had one member with fifteen years of service. The University of Michigan had two members each with thirteen years of service and one with twelve years of service on the Board of Regents.

In general, an excellent situation is shown with respect to the actual length of tenure of the members of the present boards of the State-controlled institutions of higher education in Michigan. At least two-thirds of the members serving in June, 1958, on each of the boards have had a sufficiently long tenure in office to become thoroughly familiar with the problems of the institution; yet each board (with the exception of Ferris Institute) has also some members who have been added fairly recently, thus making it possible for new ideas and fresh points of view to be brought to bear on the problems of the institution.

The people of Michigan owe a real debt of gratitude to the citizens who have served and are serving as members of the governing boards of the various institutions of higher education. Service as a board member carries no pecuniary rewards, nor is it particularly gratifying to one who enjoys the sheer exercise of power. It is a service, moreover, that requires considerable sacrifice of time from personal pursuits. Shrewd judgment must be exercised by board members in appraising the present situation of the social order and in looking toward the future and planning for it. Decisions that are often momentous and sometimes painful must be reached, at no small strain on the board member's conscience and feelings. These decisions, not infrequently, subject the board member to carping criticisms and unpleasant complaints from interested citizens or from staff members of the institution.

On the positive side, service as a board member offers a most significant opportunity for helping to shape future developments toward the greatest welfare of the State and its people. Many outstanding men and women have found their service as members of college or university governing boards a rewarding experience. Michigan has been very successful in attracting to membership on the governing boards of its colleges and universities citizens of high caliber, who have carried their responsibilities with real distinction. Effective service as a member of a college or university governing board deserves much more favorable public recognition than it is usually accorded. Michigan should be grateful to those who have served it well in such a capacity.

Geographical Limitations of Board Membership

It is commendable to find no geographical limitations set for the membership on five of the six boards of the State-controlled institutions of higher education in Michigan. The one exception is the Board of Control of Michigan College of Mining and Technology, four of whose six members must, by statute, be residents of the Upper Peninsula. Such a limitation raises a question as to whether this institution is maintained chiefly for the benefit of the Upper Peninsula, or for the entire State.

In the ordinary course of appointment-making, the Governor and the Senate may be expected to make sure there is adequate representation of the various geographically distributed interests in the State. It is generally considered unwise to have such a geographical limitation on the selection of board members written into the statutes, for the State institutions are expected to serve, not a limited area, but the entire State. It is recommended that the statute providing for the Board of Control of Michigan College of Mining and Technology (C.L. 390.352) be amended by striking out the clause requiring four of the members to be residents of the Upper Peninsula.

Presiding Officers

The Constitution of Michigan specifically designates the President of the University of Michigan and the President of the Agricultural College (Michigan State University) as the presiding officer of their respective Boards. Neither the Constitution nor the statutes, so far as can be determined, make any reference to a presiding officer of the State Board of Education, though the Constitution makes the State Superintendent of Public Instruction the secretary of that Board. Other statutes presume that there is a "president" of the State Board of Education (C.L. 390.402, C.L. 390.413, and C.L. 395.3). By custom, the members of the State Board of Education elect their presiding officer. The statutes (C.L. 395.353) provide that the Board of Control of the Michigan College of Mining and Technology shall "elect one of their number president." The statute governing Ferris Institute (Public Acts of 1949, No. 114) is silent concerning any presiding officer for the Board of Control of that institution, but the catalog of the Institute lists a member of the Board as chairman, presumably chosen for that office by the Board itself.

The recently enacted statute for Wayne State University is ambiguous with respect to the presiding officer of the Board of Governors. In Public Acts of 1956, No. 183, the last sentence of section 4 states that the President of the University shall preside at Board meetings. But the first sentence of section 5 states that the Board shall elect a chairman from its membership. It would be very unusual to have a chairman of a board who does not preside at meetings, for that would normally be his chief function. The chairman of a college or university board does have some other functions, such as the signing of official papers and diplomas, appearance at public occasions, etc., and it would not be impossible to have one person preside at board meetings and another to bear the title of chairman of the board. This would not be a normal situation, however. It is recommended that the statute governing Wayne State University (Public Acts of 1956, No. 183) be amended to provide that the chairman of the Board of Governors shall be elected from the membership of the Board and shall preside at meetings of the Board.

It is generally not considered a wise arrangement for the president of a college or university to be the presiding officer of its board. The chief executive officer of the institution should be present at all board meetings, except possibly on occasions when the board is discussing matters affecting his personal relationships to the institution, such as his salary, tenure, and any general evaluation of his services. The president should certainly have the privilege of speaking to the board on any subject before it. In fact, he should probably do much more talking in meetings of the board than is normally appropriate for a presiding officer. The actual running of board meetings, and the performance of other duties incidental to the chairmanship of a board, are best left to a member of the board chosen as chairman by his fellow members. The provisions that violate this principle at the University of Michigan and Michigan State University are embedded in the State Constitution (Article XI sections 5 and 8) and, therefore, cannot easily be changed. It is recommended that, if and when a convention is called for a general revision of the State Constitution, consideration be given to the elimination of the provisions that the Presidents of the University of Michigan and Michigan State University shall be the presiding officers of their respective governing boards.

The Community College Boards

The Michigan statutes provide two different bases for the organization of community colleges. Institutions of this type may be organized either as a part of a unified program in a single school district, or on the basis of an entire county or group of counties. The great majority of the community colleges in Michigan are of the first type, that is they are in each case a part of a city public school system. Only one institution, Northwestern Michigan College at Traverse City, has thus far been operated on a county basis, although another was authorized by the voters in November, 1957, to be set up on a three-county basis (Bay, Saginaw, and Midland Counties) and will doubtless be put into operation in the not distant future. The statutes actually provide a third basis for community college operation, by the joining of two or more school districts in the organization, but thus far no community college has been organized in Michigan on this basis.

The community colleges organized and operated by a single city school district are under the control of the board of education of that district. The city superintendent of schools is the chief executive officer of the board of education. In all cases but one, the chief executive officer of the community college, known as the dean or director, is responsible to the city superintendent of schools. In the one exception, the dean of the community college (in this case called a junior college) is responsible directly to the city board of education. The community college that is organized on a county basis (Northwestern Michigan College at Traverse City) is controlled by a board representing the school districts in the county; the chief executive officer of this community college, with the title of dean, is responsible directly to the community college board.

The initial establishment of a new community college must be approved by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Once the institution is approved, however, there is no continuing supervision of its program from the office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction or any other central State agency, beyond the normal sort of reporting that applies to all public school systems. The community colleges receive State funds, based on a flat amount per student in attendance, as determined by the Legislature. The community colleges may also qualify for State funds to meet 50 per cent of their capital outlay payments, on a grant basis, up to the limit of the amount annually appropriated for this purpose by the Legislature, and subject to approval by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. In general, each local community college board operates its institution with little or no direct control from State sources, after the initial establishment has been approved.

The Present Lack of Coordination

The duties and responsibilities of the boards having control of State institutions of higher education in Michigan have been delineated by statute or, in some cases, by the State Constitution. Those duties and responsibilities in each case pertain to the individual institution (or group of institutions, in the case of the State Board of Education) over which the individual board has authority. On none of the boards is any responsibility laid for the general development of higher education in the State as a whole. Each board is autonomous and independent of any connection with any of the other boards, except as the State Superintendent of Public Instruction holds ex officio membership on all of them (presumably) and has the right to speak but not to vote in their meetings.

The provision in the Constitution (Article XI Section 2) for the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to be an ex officio member of all " . . . boards having control of public instruction in any state institution, with the right to speak but not to vote," was doubtless introduced as a means of maintaining liaison among the various institutional boards, so that each board might be informed of plans and decisions made by all the others. Only to a very limited extent, however, has it proved possible, in practice, for any effective liaison to be maintained among the college and university boards by having the State Superintendent of Public Instruction serve as an ex officio member on each of them.

Each of the six boards usually meets monthly, sometimes for two-day sessions, choosing its own time and place for the meeting. Occasionally two or more of the boards will be meeting on the same date, or in locations and at times such that one man could not possibly attend all the meetings. Even if conflicts in dates could be avoided, it would require from 30 to 40 per cent of the total working time of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction if he attended every meeting of every board. He must attend the meetings of the State Board of Education, for he is the secretary and one of the four voting members of that Board. The State Board of Education has a great many matters to consider that relate to the public elementary and secondary schools of the State, as well as the operating management of the four college-level institutions that are under its control.

Furthermore, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction is a very busy official of the State government, with manifold responsibilities in connection with the public school system, with many meetings, other than those of the institutional boards, to attend. He has important decisions to make. There are many requirements on his time for appearances at public occasions and for addresses to important groups throughout the State, to say nothing of the responsibility of representing the State of Michigan in national and international conferences on educational problems. No matter how conscientiously the State Superintendent of Public Instruction might try to carry out his constitutional privilege of attending institutional board meetings, he could not logically be expected to attend all meetings of every board, or even any considerable percentage of those meetings.

In the past, the State Superintendents of Public Instruction did not try to attend meetings of the controlling boards of the educational institutions, other than the State Board of Education. The present incumbent, however, on first taking office in 1957, did make a sincere effort to attend all meetings of every institutional board, as provided in the Constitution, but he has been unable to carry through such a program.

Even if the State Superintendent of Public Instruction were to attend every meeting of every institutional board, his non-voting status would leave him with only minor influence on matters that might affect the program of higher education in the State as a whole. It must be concluded that the constitutional provision for ex officio membership of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction on every institutional board is ineffective in providing liaison or coordination among the programs and operations of the several State-controlled institutions of higher education in Michigan.

As the situation now exists, each of the six boards has control over its own policies, and determines the budget that will be presented to the State fiscal authorities and the Legislature in the support of requests for appropriations. No coordinating agency has been set up, either officially or informally, to assist the Legislature and the State fiscal authorities in determining the amounts to be appropriated to each of the nine State-controlled institutions of higher education in Michigan. The Legislature itself is the only effective coordinating agency. In making its decisions about the amounts of money to be appropriated to each institution, the Legislature must weigh the various kinds of programs maintained and the relative needs of the institutions for supporting funds. In actual practice the final determination of the appropriations is the result of an extensive and intensive lobbying activity by the individual institutions, each on its own behalf. Each of the State-controlled institutions attempts to protect its own interests in obtaining funds from the Legislature. The community colleges, as a group, are also active in seeing that the Legislature does not neglect the provision of supporting funds for current operations and capital outlay in their segment of higher education.

Not only is there a complete lack of any legally constituted coordinating mechanism for publicly controlled higher education in Michigan, other than through the Legislature, but arrangements for informal coordination have not been developed to any effective degree. There is a voluntary Council of State College Presidents, which has attempted to present to the Legislature a unified picture of the total needs of the nine State-controlled institutions. Usually the chairman of this group, in recent years, has made the initial presentation of needs to the Legislature. After this initial presentation, however, each institution has been very much on its own with respect to the approach to the Legislature for funds. The Council of State College Presidents makes no real attempt to coordinate the budget requests of the several institutions in terms of an objective appraisal of their needs and the needs of higher education in the State of Michigan as a whole. There is also a voluntary association representing the community colleges, which has been effective in presenting a unified appeal for the support of these institutions, and in obtaining a flat amount per student attending the community colleges and in supporting the plea for capital outlay funds.

Neither the Council of State College Presidents nor the Michigan Junior College Association has done much to coordinate the programs of instruction, research, and service in the various institutions in the State. Perhaps more has been accomplished in the field of extension services by means of voluntary cooperation among the State-controlled institutions than in any other aspect of the programs of higher education in Michigan.

As in most other States, little or nothing has been done to coordinate the total program of publicly controlled and privately controlled higher education in Michigan. There are some voluntary associations that meet annually for the discussion of common problems, but these are relatively weak and ineffective in Michigan. Even the communication among institutions, and particularly between the publicly controlled and the privately controlled groups, is not good in Michigan. Michigan lacks a strong and effective voluntary association, such as is maintained in Ohio through the Ohio College Association, that provides easy communication and a non-coercive coordinating influence among all the institutions, both publicly and privately controlled, in the State.

Not only does Michigan lack any effective coordinating agency for higher education within the State, but there are also no arrangements for inter-state cooperation in higher education between Michigan and other States. Such organizations have been set up in three different regions of the United States on the basis of inter-state compacts, in the Southern, the Western, and the New England States. The Midwest has shown no enthusiasm for a regional agency in higher education, and Michigan, like the other States in the same part of the country, operates its program of higher education without any organized cooperation with other States.

In summary, it must be concluded that coordination of institutional programs of higher education in Michigan is almost non-existent. Each of the publicly controlled institutions operates completely independently of all the others, except in the case of the four that are under the State Board of Education. Even among these four the coordination is limited to such matters as a geographical or territorial designation of responsibility and a supposedly uniform salary scale. The pattern of control through boards for the State-controlled institutions is rather confused, and no consistent plan has been followed in setting up the boards for the various publicly controlled institutions of higher education in the State. The general problem of introducing suitable coordination in the program of publicly controlled higher education in Michigan will be discussed in the subsequent chapters of this report.

CHAPTER II

THE NECESSITY FOR STATE-WIDE COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

In every State that operates two or more publicly controlled institutions of higher education, some kind of an arrangement for coordinating the programs in those institutions on a State-wide basis has been found to be necessary. The present discussion of the necessity for coordination would apply to almost any State, and for the most part particular reference is not made to conditions in Michigan except as similar conditions are found almost universally in other States.

The basic principle upon which the operation of State-controlled institutions of higher education rests is the concern for the general welfare of and service to the entire State. But when the service is rendered through institutions, as is always the case in modern programs of higher education, the welfare of the individual institution oftentimes assumes greater importance than the service to the entire State.

There is always a marked tendency for pressure groups in any State to build up around the interests of each individual institution. The personnel on the payroll of the institution soon come to have a vested interest in its maintenance and development, and that interest is likely to take precedence over the broader interests of the State as a whole. The citizens of each community in which an institution is located also take an almost proprietary interest in it. Their economic affairs are closely intertwined with the prosperity of the local instituion, so the citizens of the community form an important pressure group whose concern is institution-centered rather than State-centered. An example of the operation of this principle is sometimes seen when suggestion is made for the moving of a State college or university from a poor location to one where it would have opportunity of giving much greater service to the State. Such a suggestion always encounters strong resistance from the group of local citizens, and almost always such a group is successful in defeating the effort to move, even though the move would be a great advantage to the State.

The sum of the pressures from the individual institutions and from the citizens of the communities in which they are located does not necessarily add up to the best possible program of service for the entire State, within the limits of the funds that can be made available. Almost invariably some institutions are more aggressive than others in urging their needs for support and development. Some institutions may be overly modest or even negligent in presenting their cases. Areas of the State in which no institution is presently located usually have no spokesman to make effective pleas for needed services. Thus, the program of the State is likely to be spotty, highly developed or even over-developed in some centers, while meagerly supported or even non-existent in others.

In earlier times, when the institutions of higher education were relatively small, were simple in their organization, and were fewer in number than at present, the Legislature itself could do the necessary coordination through its actions on requests for appropriations. In those times the other operations of the State and its agencies were also relatively small and simple. The Legislature and the fiscal authorities of the Executive Branch of State Government could readily review the needs of all the individual institutions, agencies, and other operating units of the State.

In recent times there has been a large growth in the size of most State educational institutions, and some increase in their number in many States. The volume of the State's operations in other fields, such as highways, welfare, public health, conservation, etc., has increased enormously. Today in every State the system of agencies and services, all of which seemingly demand more financial support every year, is so complex that one man can scarcely carry in mind the whole of it, much less be expert in all the manifold phases of the operations. Under these conditions the Legislature finds it impossible to give the same detailed attention and consideration to institutional requests for appropriations that it was formerly able to give.

Within the field of higher education, the growth in size and complexity of the institutions, and the multiplicity of the programs of instruction, research, and service that are maintained, have compounded the difficulty of analyzing accurately and comprehensively the institutional needs for support. The resources of a State are usually not sufficiently elastic to meet all the growing needs for support, as presented by the various operational units. Decisions must be reached about the distribution of the available support so that it will produce the greatest results in terms of benefit to the State. To do this for the complex programs of higher education maintained today in most States requires a high degree of professional knowledge and skill. In earlier times, when institutions were small and simple, it was relatively easy to appraise their needs for support. But today it is a difficult and complicated problem to make a just and equitable estimate of the amount of State funds needed to operate each institution in the State system on comparable levels of effectiveness.

In general, the available techniques of analyzing the finances of institutions of higher education have not kept pace with the growth in the complexity of institutional operations and functions. One of the newer functions, that has only in the last few decades attained a large magnitude in respect to total institutional operations, is research. No good techniques have yet been developed for analyzing the needs for the support of research, or for evaluating the relative accomplishments attained by the expenditures for that purpose, in comparison with expenditures for instruction or even in comparison among various research fields and projects. As another example of a recently developed field, most colleges and universities in the past few decades have introduced an extensive range of student personnel services, including such activities as the careful selection of students for admission, orientation and counseling of students, health services, recreational services, placement services, and a host of others. Again, techniques are lacking for appraising the needs of an institution for such services and for evaluating the results of the money expended in the support of these activities. In many institutions the financial accounting systems are not set up and operated in such a way that one can determine at all accurately how much money is spent in support of a function such as research or student personnel services.

It must be confessed that most institutions of higher education probably do not make adequate analyses of their own operations, particularly with a view to improving their efficiency and obtaining more results from the presently available resources. For example, very few institutions have made penetrating analyses of their utilization of classroom and laboratory space, yet they continually bring pressure for more classroom and laboratory buildings, even though they lack evidence that the present facilities are used efficiently. Quite commonly, when analyses of institutional operations are made, publicity is given only to results that support the needs for larger appropriations or operating funds; much less frequently are the results of such studies used to tighten up the operations so as to squeeze more returns from the presently available resources. Institutions, as a rule, find it easier to get new and additional funds to meet their expanding needs, than to tighten up the efficiency of their own operations as a means of financing expansions and improvements.

If the institutions lack adequate techniques for making critical analyses of their programs, and in general fail to display much enthusiasm for introducing such techniques for analyzing their operations, the Legislature and the State fiscal authorities are at an even greater loss in weighing the needs of the various colleges and universities for supporting funds. The Legislature and the State fiscal authorities rarely have sufficient staff with the kind of competence required to make penetrating analyses of the needs of the State educational institutions for appropriations. These State agencies generally do not have staff members who are familiar with the limited techniques now available for analyzing programs and finances of institutions of higher education, or for inventing new and improved techniques for such analyses.

Furthermore, the Legislature meets for a relatively short time each year (or biennially in many States), and there is never enough time for the members to study thoroughly the voluminous detail necessary to get an adequate picture of the needs of each educational institution. The membership of the Legislature changes, too, and it often seems that, as soon as some leading member of the appropriations committee begins to become reasonably familiar with the evaluation of institutional requests for funds, he gets elected to some other office, or withdraws from political life, and thus his knowledge may no longer be applied to legislative problems in higher education.

To meet the situation arising from the modern extent and complexity of State operations in higher education, a number of States have developed a central coordinating agency, staffed by competent personnel, with the function of making continuous studies of the programs, operations, and needs of the colleges and universities. Such a central agency can furnish the Legislature and the State fiscal authorities trustworthy and pertinent information that is useful in determining the relative needs of the various institutions of higher education for appropriations. The central agency can also feed back to each institution data concerning its operations, in comparison with the other institutions in the system; this enables the officials of each individual institution to make wise decisions about their own operations.

In the past the institutions of higher education, even those that have made analyses of their own programs as a matter of administrative routine, have lacked adequate comparative data from other similar institutions. As an example of the value of such comparative data, it may be noted that some of the large universities of the Middle West and California have voluntarily engaged in a comprehensive study of their programs and financing, so that each may have the benefit of the analysis of the data from all the others.

One of the great difficulties in the establishment and operation of a central coordinating agency in a State is to find staff members who are competent to make and interpret the necessary analyses of data from the institutions. The task requires someone with an unusually broad and comprehensive grasp of the entire range of institutional operations in higher education -- the instructional program, research, service activities, libraries, physical plant, finance, administrative organization, and many others. The level of competence required is approximately the same as that for the presidency of a large and complex university. In some States the value of a coordinating agency has been lost or greatly reduced because of unwillingness to pay the price necessary for competent leadership and direction.

The discussion of the need for coordination has thus far centered mainly around the problem of determining the needs of the institutions for appropriations. Coordination in a State's program of higher education is needed, not only in determining needs for appropriations, but in obtaining the best possible service for the State as a whole. In the American governmental and educational system, the State is recognized as the unit that is responsible for the publicly controlled provisions for higher education. If the States do not carry on this function effectively, pressures will surely arise for the Federal Government to take it over. Indeed, the criticisms of education that have been so prevalent during the past year have led some people to conclude that the States have already failed, and that the Federal Government must begin to take over the management and control of higher education, as well as other elements of the educational system. Most Americans would not want to see this happen, and the best prevention against its happening is a vigorously supported State program of higher education.

The principle that the State is the governmental agency responsible for the maintenance of higher education is recognized everywhere in this country. It is expressed in the Constitution of the State of Michigan (Article XI Section 10). It would seem to follow logically that the State should have some central agency that accepts responsibility for the development of higher education as a total service. The State now does this in a number of other areas, such as highways, public welfare, conservation, and corrections. The State, for example, does not split up its administration of the highway system into a number of separate geographical areas, with an administrator or board in charge of each area, and with each area operated autonomously with respect to location, construction, and maintainance of highways, and with each area approaching the Legislature independently, and in competition with the other areas, for supporting funds. Similarly the prison system, operated in Michigan under the Michigan Corrections Commission, is considered as a single unit, and the various prisons, reformatories, and houses of correction do not make independent and separate appeals to the Legislature for their support, competing with each other for the available funds. Although the functions of higher education are quite different from those of the prison system, it would seem equally logical for the Legislature to consider the needs for the support of higher education in the State as a whole, rather than for each individual operating unit or institution to make its case for needed support independently and in competition with the others.

If the provisions for higher education are left solely to the developments in the individual institutions, there is no assurance that the best service to the entire State will result, or that the program will be organized economically. Under such conditions there is an inevitable tendency to consider the welfare and aggrandizement of the individual institution ahead of the needs of the total State program. This tendency, sometimes labelled "empire building," is not only inevitable but necessary. In general, it is a source of strength in higher education. Certainly it is wise for every institution to strive for the highest level of effective service that it can possibly render.

The forces that lead an institution to strive to be as excellent (and perhaps as big) as it can be are powerful. A president's success is measured largely by the extent to which the institution grows and strengthens its own program -- regardless of how such growth and development may affect other institutions or the State program as a whole. Members of the board of control properly have an intense loyalty to their institution, and the development of their institution is usually more important to them than that of any other unit in the State's system of higher education. Alumni generally have a deep-seated loyalty to their alma mater, and they tend to form a pressure group to support its growth and development. Sometimes the alumni of one institution have developed a positive hate for one or more other institutions in the system, and they would be pleased at anything or everything which would tend to destroy or diminish the effectiveness of these other institutions. Members of the Legislature (or a Governor or other influential official), elected from a community or area in which an educational institution is located, often tend to consider that the aggrandizement of that institution should take precedence over all the other needs of the State in higher education.

The function of a central coordinating agency is not to eliminate these institutional ambitions for excellence in program and expansion in services. Instead, the function is that of directing such ambitions along lines that will be most helpful to the total State program. Again, it must be emphasized that the maintainence of one or more excellent and large institutions does not necessarily result in the best possible service in higher education for the entire State. The problem must be viewed in terms of the interests of the State as a whole, rather than in terms of what, at the moment, seems to be good for a given institution.

A State-wide program of higher education that is left entirely to the ambitions of the individual institutions is apt to develop a number of instances of undesirable and uneconomical duplication of service. Attention must be called to the fact that not all duplication is wasteful or undesirable. Most of it is very useful and even necessary. For example, no criticism of duplication of services can be made when each institution maintains courses in freshman-level mathematics. The test for undesirability in duplicated services is the same as the test for services that are unique or unduplicated, namely, does the program serve a real need, and does it have sufficient patronage to operate at an economical level. The instances of wasteful duplication among programs of institutions of higher education are considerably rarer than is commonly supposed by members of State Legislatures. There is always the potentiality, however, that undesirable duplication will develop when each institution has full authority to develop whatever programs it wishes.

Sometimes an unnecessary duplication of programs arises simply because one institution does not know what developments have taken place or are in process in one or more other institutions. Such cases are normally infrequent, because inter-institutional communication among staff members at the operating level in most specialized fields is reasonably good, even though no formal organization for sharing information has been established. Thus, if a program of research in some specialized field of biology, such as limnology, were to be proposed at one institution, the staff members at that institution would most likely know about the particular kinds of research in the same field that are under way in other institutions of the State and region, and would probably not want to duplicate those research projects completely. One function of a central coordinating agency is to facilitate communication among the institutions on matters of program development, so that each may know what all the others are doing and are planning to do.

Among institutions of higher education, one sometimes finds that program development is guided by what can only be designated as a "me too" attitude. That is, if one institution develops a new program or service that looks as if it might be successful, other institutions decide they have to do the same, regardless of the needs that might be served by additional, duplicating programs. A good idea should, naturally, be adopted widely and rapidly. But the function of a coordinating agency is to distinguish shrewdly between those proposed developments that are soundly based on appraisal of needs and potentialities for services, and those that represent only an effort to "keep up with the Joneses."

In summary on the problem of duplication of programs, the function of a central State coordinating agency is not to forestall or prevent institutions from developing new programs, or even from duplicating programs already set up in other institutions. The function, rather, is to advise when such development or duplication is wise and when it seems unwise. Again, it should be emphasized that a high level of staff competence is required in the coordinating agency if its advice on such problems is to be respected and followed. Institutions should follow the advice of the coordinating agency in such matters because they recognize its competence, and preferably not because of any actual powers or control the coordinating agency exercises directly.

A State program of higher education that is left entirely to the ambitions of the individual institutions is apt to develop not only some wasteful duplication but also a number of "blind spots" in the coverage of the real needs of the State. Institutional leaders sometimes do not fully realize the educational needs of the area and the clientele they serve. Sometimes institutional programs are developed more in terms of what is traditional or what is academically respectable, than in terms of the real needs for education. An example that has recently been given publicity is the announcement of a large State university that it will no longer provide remedial courses for high-school graduates who cannot meet standards of what is considered "college-level" work in such fields as English and mathematics. Such students will, in the future, be refused entrance according to the announcement from that University. The question must then be raised as to who is to provide the instruction that these high-school graduates need and want. If a State university is unwilling to provide the service, it would seem that the State Legislature will have to look to some other institution or agency to render the service, and will have to redistribute appropriations in such a way as to provide support for the service in the institution that is willing to render it.

A central coordinating agency has a responsibility for continuing alertness to the needs of the State as a whole for services in higher education. Such needs should be called to the attention of the institutions that should be serving them. The central coordinating agency should have no power to compel an institution to take on a service that it does not want to render. The development of needed new programs can be encouraged by assistance in getting them financed. Usually an institution is willing to undertake a needed program if it is financed, but if no existing institution is willing to undertake a much needed service, the central State agency may have to suggest some other means of providing the service.

Coordination of a State's program in higher education does not mean rigid uniformity or the elimination of competititon among institutions, as is sometimes erroneously assumed. The coordinating agency should give every encouragement to diversity in institutional programs. It should encourage competition among the institutions for excellence in quality of programs. It should also encourage every institution to use the funds made available to it in such a way as to get the largest possible amount of useful service to the State. Efficient use of resources should be rewarded, not penalized as is now sometimes done in State budgetary procedure, when an institution, that has operated economically, is "rewarded" by having its appropriation cut the following year.

In general, the policy of an effective coordinating agency in higher education in these times should not require any institution to cut back or to eliminate any existing program, except as the institution itself decides such a step would be wise. Instead, the influence of the coordinating agency should be exerted on proposals for new developments. The reason for suggesting the policy of not cutting back on existing programs is that this is a time of general expansion in higher education. Some programs that are at present uneconomical will become fully justified, in terms of volume of service rendered, as the expanding enrollments continue to flood the colleges and universities. If different conditions were prevailing, and higher education generally was at a standstill or actually retrenching, then the coordinating agency might have to take the lead in suggesting where cutbacks could be accomplished with the least damage to the entire State program.

In summary on the major point of the necessity for coordination, it may be said that coordination of some sort is inevitable in any State system of higher education composed of two or more institutions. The only questions are, who shall do the coordinating and how shall it be done. It can be left chiefly to the Legislature, as it has been in the past in Michigan, with appropriations determined to a considerable extent by the pressures of institutional lobbyists. It can be left to voluntary action by the institutions themselves. It can be delegated to some central State agency specially designated for the purpose. The plans followed in some other States will be reviewed in Chapter IV of this report, and a suggested plan for Michigan will be developed in Chapter V.

It should be noted that Michigan already has some experience with the coordination of certain units of its total State program of higher education. The four institutions referred to in the Constitution (Article XI, Section 6) as "the state normal college and the state normal schools" (now Eastern Michigan College, Central

Michigan College, Northern Michigan College, and Western Michigan University, respectively) are under a single board, the State Board of Education. This is a form of coordination, and its effects are evident in certain features of the operations of these institutions. For example, there is a territorial division of the State among the four institutions as their recognized areas of service. Considerable uniformity has been developed in the salary scales among these four institutions. There is probably more communication and informal agreement among the presidents of these four institutions than among any similar group in Michigan.

Another example of coordination already extant in Michigan is the operation of branches by two of the institutions -- Michigan College of Mining and Technology at Sault Ste. Marie and the University of Michigan at Flint. In each case the program of the branch is "coordinated" with that of the parent institution through the central institutional administration and controlling board. In the case of the branch at Flint, there has also been a certain measure of voluntary coordination with the Flint Junior College, so that each of the separate institutions has its own distinctive program and field of service.

Finally, it may be noted that Michigan has three universities that are large and complex in their organization, each of which exhibits in its own operations a fully coordinated program. The University of Michigan enrolls more students than the entire State system of higher education enrolls in any one of half the States in the United States. Michigan State University and Wayne State University also each have more students than the entire system of higher education enrolls in many of the States. Each of these universities in Michigan is composed of a number of different colleges and schools, which are managed in each case by the central university administration through a coordinated form of control. The problem of State-wide coordination is thus not unlike that which these large Michigan universities now face and solve in their own internal organization.

CHAPTER III

PRINCIPLES OF COORDINATION AND CONTROL

Certain basic principles for the establishment and operation of a desirable pattern of coordination and control within a State system of higher education can be derived from the long experience with the operation of publicly controlled colleges and universities in the United States. In the development of such principles in the present chapter, they will be stated and discussed in abstract terms. Reference will be made to the experience in Michigan chiefly for illustrative purposes. Recommendations for specific action in Michigan will be reserved for a later chapter of this report.

The first principle that must be kept in mind is that a State's program of higher education is strong only as the individual institutions are strong and maintain services of high quality in the programs that are offered. The service of higher education is rendered through individual institutions, and if some or all of those institutions are of second-rate or third-rate quality, the service will not be what it should be. No matter how effective the system of control and coordination may be, the State can have a suitable service in higher education only through strong individual institutions. The primary purpose of the State's system of control and coordination should be to encourage the development of the greatest possible strength in the individual institutions of the system.

The strength of an institution must always be evaluated in terms of the specific programs it offers. A college does not have to offer a wide variety of programs to be strong. An institution may actually weaken its strength by spreading its resources too thinly over too wide a variety of programs. The principle that individual institutions must be strong means only that whatever programs they offer should be of good quality. Some variation is to be expected in the strength and quality of the various programs offered within any institution and among the various institutions of a State system of higher education. In general terms, choice must be made between two alternative courses of action with respect to the weaker programs -- either they should be strengthened, or they should eventually be discontinued. The general objective of a satisfactory State system of higher education cannot be attained by continuing indefinitely to maintain some institutions, or some programs within certain institutions, on a substandard level of quality.

The second important principle is that the mere presence of one or more strong institutions does not add up to an effective State program of higher education. All the institutions in the system must be strong, if the service is to be effective. This is particularly true in a State of large area, because students tend to go to whatever college or university is close to their homes. Evidence on this point was shown for Michigan in Staff Study No. 2 of the Survey Series[1], on the Geographic Origins of Michigan College Students, in which it was shown that the counties in which a State-controlled institution is located have about three times as many young people attending college, in proportion to the college-age population, as the counties that have no institution of higher education at all within their borders. The same facts have been abundantly demonstrated in many other States. Thus, if the people of the State are to have adequate service in higher education, it is necessary that all the institutions be strong, so that no matter which one a student attends, he or she will have opportunity for an education of good quality. Furthermore, a suitable geographical distribution of strong programs is necessary, if all the people of the State are to be well served by the institutions of higher education.

---

[1] John Dale Russell and Orvin T. Richardson, Geographic Origins of Michigan College Students. Staff Study No. 2, the Survey of Higher Education in Michigan. Prepared for the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, State Capitol, Lansing, Michigan. August, 1957.

The third important principle is that strength in an institution is closely associated with autonomy in the making of essential decisions affecting the institution's operations. It is virtually impossible to build a strong institution of higher education unless it is given the maximum of self-determination in its operations. The people of Michigan do not need to look outside the State for supporting evidence for this principle. The State-controlled institutions of Michigan that are nationally and internationally known for their outstanding strength and quality are those that, over a long period of years, have had the maximum freedom from external controls by the State and its agencies. The freedom from control by the Legislature and the State fiscal authorities, that is guaranteed these institutions by the Constitution, has indeed been considered objectionable in some quarters of the State government, but the fact cannot be denied that the freedom from outside control in the case of these two Michigan institutions has been associated with the development of exceptionally strong programs of higher education. Because of this principle, that institutional strength is closely associated with the maximum degree of institutional autonomy, it follows that any plan of State-wide control and coordination should involve the minimum of interference with the essential features of local operating management.

The fourth important principle is that the necessary functions of coordination can be carried on with no harmful interference in institutional autonomy. There are at least three necessary functions involved in coordinating a State program of higher education. One function is the collection and analysis of pertinent data concerning institutional programs, facilities, and finances. It is not an interference with institutional autonomy to require uniform and complete reporting to a central State agency. Such reporting is an obligation of any operation that gets its support from public funds. The collection and analysis of such data is, in any event, a necessary part of good management in the individual institution, so it should impose no additional burden in an effectively managed college or university. The individual institution, furthermore, benefits greatly from the availability of carefully analyzed data from all the institutions in the system. The preparation and analysis of such data is one of the most significant functions of a central coordinating agency for a State system of higher education.

Another important function of a central coordinating agency is the giving of advice and counsel to the individual institutions in the State system of higher education. It is not an interference with institutional autonomy to receive advice from the competent professional staff of a central coordinating agency, provided the institution is not compelled to follow that advice. Experience in many States, where there is a competently staffed coordinating agency, indicates that officials of the individual institutions often take the initiative in seeking advice and counsel from the central agency on many problems. The availability of such a service is a real asset to the institutions in the State. In the operation of such a service, the coordinating agency must take the point of view that it is only offering advice, not dictating a course of action that must be followed. Violations of such a policy must be carefully avoided if the coordinating agency is to render its greatest service.

A third important function for the central coordinating agency is the review of institutional requests for appropriations and the making of recommendations to the Legislature regarding each institution's needs for financial support. These recommendations must be carefully balanced so that each institution receives equal and just treatment. Such a process involves no interferences with essential institutional autonomy. The process must be carried on by some central agency in any event, for the Legislature must make a final decision about appropriations. The Legislature benefits greatly by the information and recommendations furnished by a central coordinating agency. In effect, the Legislature has the advantage of a sort of pre-audit of institutional needs and programs. To have this information from a neutral agency, rather than directly from the institutions and their lobbyists, gives the Legislature much more confidence in the completeness and the accuracy with which each institution's picture is being presented.

Experience in other States indicates that, in the long run, the institutions also benefit in their support by appropriations, as the Legislature gains confidence in the analysis that the coordinating agency makes of their needs for support. One cannot fail to observe that in Michigan such confidence is at present almost completely lacking, principally because the Legislature does not have any agency to which it can turn as a disinterested source for accurate and complete data about all aspects of the operations of the State-controlled institutions. A service of providing the Legislature and the State fiscal authorities with a review of institutional requests for appropriations and recommendations regarding the needs of the institutions for appropriations certainly cannot be considered an interference with essential institutional autonomy.

The fifth important principle involves the necessity of differentiating two important aspects of the control of institutions of higher education in a State-wide system. These functions are (1) the control and management of the internal operations of the individual institutions, and (2) the coordination of the entire system. It seems clear that the activities involved in coordination must take place outside the individual institutions. The very essence of coordination requires a single State agency for that purpose. In contrast, the control and management of the internal operations of the individual institution can best be left to an agency concerned with only that institution. In other words, the final operating controls over a State college or university should be in that institution's own board.

Observation of experience throughout the United States indicates that it is difficult to combine the functions of coordination and operating control in a single board, especially if there are numerous institutions in the State system. If the institutions are few, probably no more than three or at most five, examples can be found where some success has been obtained with a single board serving both the functions of coordination and operating controls. Almost invariably, however, when there are more than a few institutions in a system and the attempt is made to combine under a single board the two functions of coordination and operating controls, one or the other of the functions is gravely neglected. Either the single board has to give so much attention to the details of supervising institutional operations that the coordinating function is neglected, or the board, in giving more of its attention to problems of coordination, neglects its function of operational supervision. Under the first of these alternatives, the essential function of coordination is likely to be done by "meat-ax" methods, without due regard to the infinite and delicate details that need to be observed in the development of programs and services in the individual institutions. Under the second of the alternatives, when the board centers its efforts mainly on coordination, the actual operation of each institution is likely to be left too largely to the administrative staff, and important decisions about operating policies are made at the executive level without the benefit of the wise counsel and the representation of the public interests that are to be obtained from the members of a board of control.

Especially as an institution grows in size and in the complexity of its organization, the problems of operational control demand the full and undivided attention of a single board. Even now some of the Michigan institutions are so large and complex that it must be very difficult for the members of their boards of control to understand fully all the matters on which they must make decisions. The agenda for each board meeting contains a long list of items. Many of these will be passed, on the recommendation of the chief executive officer, with almost a rubber-stamp action by the board. It is an excellent situation when the members of the board have full confidence in the wisdom of their chief executive officer, but this does not relieve the board of the responsibility for the actions it takes, and to be properly responsible for actions taken the individual members of the board should understand them fully.

The board of control of any large and complex institution has a most important responsibility, one that demands its full attention. To combine the operating controls of several such institutions under a single board, and to expect that board also to be responsible for the coordination of those institutions, is to lay far too broad a responsibility on a single agency. It is better to assign the function of coordination to some single State-wide agency, and to provide an individual board of control for each institution for the supervision of its general operations.

The experience in Michigan may be reviewed briefly with reference to the need for institutional boards of control. The three largest universities in Michigan have achieved their present level of distinction under a plan by which each has its own board of control. Ferris Institute and Michigan College of Mining and Technology each has an individual board. The testimony of the officials of these institutions is that their boards have been of inestimable help to them in planning and managing their programs. By contrast the four institutions that were originally normal schools -- Eastern Michigan College, Central Michigan College, Northern Michigan College, and Western Michigan University -- are under a single board of control, the State Board of Education. This was probably appropriate when those institutions were small, with their sole purpose being the preparation of teachers. But now these institutions have grown to be large in enrollments, with multi-purpose programs, and one of them has been given the status and title of a State university. Three of these four institutions have larger enrollments than either Ferris Institute or Michigan College of Mining and Technology. Clearly, it is time to raise a question as to whether the operational controls of these four Michigan institutions should continue to be lodged in a single board.

Observation of the operations of the State Board of Education indicates that the Board gives very little time to the affairs of the four institutions. At its meetings there is a long agenda of matters arising from the responsibilities for the public school system. In one two-day meeting attended by the Director of the Survey, the State Board of Education gave fifteen minutes on its agenda to the problems presented by the President of one of the four institutions, fifteen minutes to another, twenty minutes to a third, and thirty minutes to a fourth. The Board spent considerably more time in discussing and reaching a decision about the reinstatement of the teaching certificates of two former teachers, whose certificates had been revoked when they were sent to prison, than the Board spent on all the problems of four institutions of higher education involving a total of about 18,000 students and many millions of dollars of State money. This observation, plus other evidence, seems to indicate that the State Board of Education is at present greatly over-burdened by the responsibilities for managerial control of the four State institutions.

Each of the four institutions now under the State Board of Education is large enough to warrant the setting up of an individual board of control for its supervision. If this step is taken, it would be absolutely essential to set up some State-wide coordinating agency, for then the State would have nine boards of control. This would tend to increase the present confusion, for the present limited measure of coordination now achieved by having four institutions under one board would be lost, unless some agency is set up specifically for the coordinating function.

In summary on the principle that has been under discussion in preceding paragraphs, it seems vital for each institution to have its own individual board for operating controls, if the institution is to have the benefit of wise direction from a board thoroughly conversant with its affairs, and if the maximum of autonomy and flexibility is to be retained at the level of local institutional operations. At the same time, the necessary function of coordination can best be assigned to some single, central agency, that does not have any responsibility for the operating controls of any individual institution.

A final word should be said about a difficult decision that a State must always make concerning the levels of quality it shall maintain in the programs of the various institutions in the State-controlled system. Such a decision is forced by the fact that a State almost never has sufficient resources to maintain all its institutions with the variety and quality of programs that the institutional boards, administrative staffs, and faculties desire. Decision, therefore, has to be made as to the manner in which the available funds can best be distributed among the institutions so as to produce the greatest possible benefit to the entire State.

In facing the decision, the State may follow one of two plans. It may try to maintain approximately the same quality of programs in all its institutions. Or it may concentrate resources in one or two or three institutions so that they are of first-rate quality, while the other institutions are supported at a level that permits them to be only of second-rate or third-rate quality. Sometimes a State is not conscious of the fact that it has made a decision about such a policy, until the actual situation is revealed by a study of costs and other features of comparable programs in the various institutions. Essentially the decision is one that should be made on a State-wide basis, not on the basis of loyalty to or consideration for the welfare of one or more of the individual institutions in the State system of higher education.

Because of the highly localized nature of the attendance at institutions of higher education, the Director of the Survey would favor a policy of maintaining all the State's institutions at approximately the same level of quality. The contrasting policy means that the young people in some areas of the State get much better service in higher education than others living elsewhere. The young people of the State are equally precious, regardless of the places where they may live, and it would seem only just to follow a policy of providing all of them just as good service in higher education as the State can possibly afford. In following such a policy the State should not reduce or level down the quality of the programs in any of its institutions. Instead, the effort ought to be to level up the quality in those that are below par, so that they are equivalent to the best that the State now affords.

Comparisons of quality among institutions are difficult to make, even for the most competent and experienced of evaluators. Comparisons among institutions have to be made on the basis of programs that are comparable. For example, an institution maintaining a medical school cannot be compared directly in toto with an institution that has no medical school. Medical schools should be compared with medical schools, law schools with law schools, etc. Even in engineering it is necessary to compare specialities that are alike, for chemical engineering cannot be compared directly with civil engineering. In most institutions, however, there are many programs that are truly comparable. For example, most institutions maintain lower division instruction in the general liberal arts. Most of the Michigan institutions have programs of teacher education. Other examples of comparable programs could be mentioned. The point is that, in making comparisons among institutions, due regard should be had for the varied programs that are maintained.

Quality in an institutional program must always be measured in terms of what the institution attempts to do and the kinds of students it serves. Quality is not a matter of the kinds of programs maintained or of the kinds of students admitted, except as the kinds of students served are properly related to the programs maintained. It is just as possible to have a program of high quality in a two-year curriculum in cosmetology as in a curriculum leading to the Ph.D. in chemistry. If cosmetology is taught, it should be taught well, and if a graduate program in chemistry is maintained, it should be a good program. But it is important not only to have high quality in the programs, but also to make sure that students are guided into the programs of study for which their abilities and interests are suited. No matter how excellent the facilities and faculty of an institution may be, it cannot maintain a program of high quality leading to the Ph.D. in chemistry if it attempts to serve in that program students who should be studying cosmetology. And the statement is equally true when the terms are interchanged. Quality consists in doing well whatever is done for the students for whom it should be done. No one field of study or line of occupational or professional preparation has any exclusive or prior claim on the effort to maintain quality. Whatever is done by the institution should be done at the highest level of quality possible with the available resources.

Measures of quality are difficult to apply in objective terms. Under the presently available techniques, about the best that can be done is to measure the cost of programs and to assume that in a given program quality will vary directly with cost, when volume of operations is taken into account. There is adequate research evidence to support such a procedure. In fact, this is one of the basic elements in the judgment reached by the regional accrediting agency in determining whether or not a college qualifies for accrediting.

While the quality of a program does vary with its cost, efficiency of management also enters into the picture. Good management will obtain a higher quality of program than poor management, when costs are held constant per volume of operation. This is a proper institutional variation, and attempts to equalize quality on a State-wide basis should go no further than the provision of sufficient support to enable each institution to maintain, with good management, a program of a level of quality comparable to other similar programs in the State. Every institution should be encouraged to have good management, but the direct supervision of that management should be a responsibility of the local institutional board, rather than of some State-wide agency.

The size of an institutional program also enters into its costs, especially when the volume of service falls below the level for efficient operation. Small programs are oftentimes inordinately expensive; yet some small programs may be justified because of necessary service to a particular constituency. Sometimes the natural growth of an institution will take care of costly programs that are inefficient by reason of their small volume, and as patronage increases, the cost is brought to a reasonable level. Usually a newly introduced program must be tested for some years before determination can be made as to whether it will reach a volume of service that will permit it to operate at an economical level. The volume of service that will permit economical operation varies from one program to another, and can only be determined by normative data based on the experience of other institutions or on continued observation in a single institution.

Some uneconomical programs usually must be maintained in a State if adequate service is rendered to most of the geographical area. If such programs are maintained, their quality should not be reduced in the interests of equalizing costs. Decisions about the continued maintenance of uneconomical programs should not be made suddenly, but only after a thorough testing of the possibilities and generally after agreement is reached by the local institutional authorities on the desirable course of action. Michigan is fortunate in that all of its State-controlled institutions are large enough, as individual units, to operate economically. An enrollment of from 750 to 1,000 students has been shown, by research, to be about the minimum for which a degree-granting institution obtains a dollar's worth of education for a dollar of expenditure. Below this level of enrollment, the cost per student rises in an accelerating curve, without corresponding increase in quality of program. All the State-controlled institutions of Michigan have enrollments above this critical point, so that they can be expected to maintain their programs on a satisfactory basis of efficiency.

CHAPTER IV

STATE PLANS FOR THE COORDINATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Every State that maintains more than one publicly controlled institution of higher education has, of necessity, some kind of a plan or arrangement for coordination of the institutions. These plans in the various States range all the way from the minimum level involved in the retention of this function completely by the Legislature, to the maximum level involved in the establishment of a single central board for both the coordination and the operating control of the entire program of higher education. Sufficient experience has been had with most of the plans to permit the drawing of some conclusions about their relative advantages and disdavantages. For that reason it seems desirable, before recommendation is made for a plan for the coordination and control of higher education in Michigan, to review the plans followed in other States.

During the past two or three years an extensive study of the problem of Statewide coordinating systems for higher education has been under way, directed by Dr. Lyman Glenny of Sacramento State College in California. The study, financed by a foundation grant to the University of California, has involved an analysis and evaluation of the plans followed in a large number of the States for the coordination and control of higher education. The Director of the Survey of Higher Education in Michigan, knowing of Dr. Glenny's project, had been in hope that the results might be published in time to be used in the Michigan Survey. In fact, the final preparation of the present Staff Study has been delayed until the end of the Survey Series, with the thought that Dr. Glenny's results might be available for reference. At the time of this writing of Staff Study No. 12 for the Michigan Survey, however, the report from Dr. Glenny had not yet been received, so it is necessary to proceed without it. The Director of the Survey of Higher Education in Michigan has had the benefit of several conferences with Dr. Glenny, and has had opportunity to scan briefly a preliminary draft of his report. The final published version of Dr. Glenny's report, however, may differ from the ideas discussed with him, so no attempt is made in the present Staff Study to refer to his materials for supporting (or possibly conflicting) evidence.

The plans followed in the various States for the coordination and control of higher education may be grouped into several categories, ranging from the extreme of centralization to the extreme of decentralization of controls. Probably nine different categories may be recognized. Each of these will be described in turn. Three different elements are involved in the distinctions among the various plans: (1) the nature and location of the operating controls over the individual institutions; (2) the nature and location of the authority for coordinating the State-wide program; and (3) the nature of the professional staff (if any) of the coordinating agency. For sake of ready reference these plans will be referred to by numbers.

Plan No. 1 centralizes both the operating controls over individual institutions and the coordinating function in a single, central State board, with a strong professional executive heading the central staff. Under this plan none of the individual institutions has a local board for its operating control, and all such controls are lodged in the single State board that exercises also the coordinating function. Examples of States following this plan are Oregon, Georgia, North Dakota, and Mississippi. In Oregon and Georgia the chief executive officer of the central board is known as "chancellor," in North Dakota as "commissioner," and in Mississippi as "executive secretary."

Plan No. 2 also centralizes both the operating controls over individual institutions and the coordinating function in a single, central State board, but does not provide for a strong professional executive officer to head the staff of the central office. The title most commonly used for the board's executive officer, if it has any such officer, is "secretary" or "executive secretary." As in Plan No. 1, none of the individual institutions under Plan. No. 2 has its own board for operating controls, but all the board-level controls are exercised from the single, central agency. Florida, Arizona, and South Dakota are examples of States operating under such an arrangement, though each of the three is tending in the direction of developing a central professional executive staff. Idaho, Montana, and Iowa also operate their State-controlled institutions with a single board for coordination and for operating control, and without a strong central professional staff. Montana formerly had a "chancellor" as the chief executive officer of its central board controlling higher education, but that official has been discontinued.

Plan No. 3 maintains a single State board for coordinating purposes and for operating controls over the individual institutions, but also sets up for each institution a local board with limited operational authority. The only example of the plan is the State of New York, where it was adopted in 1949. In the New York system the "Board of Trustees of the State University of New York," as the central state agency is called, has a strong professional executive known as the "president." The "State University of New York" is merely the designation of the central controlling and coordinating authority, and is not an operating "university" in the sense of having a faculty and a student body on a campus. The actual operations of State-controlled higher education in New York are carried on through various local institutions. For each local institution there is an advisory board, with very limited powers, such as recommending a person to be chosen as president of the institution, and recommending to the central board the annual budget for the institution.

Plan No. 4, represented by the State of Oklahoma, provides for a single State board for coordinating purposes only, with each individual institution having a board of its own for control of operating functions. The Oklahoma pattern uses a strongly organized central professional staff, headed by an executive officer known as "Chancellor." The Oklahoma Legislature makes a single appropriation to the central coordinating board, and this board is responsible for distributing the funds to the individual institutions in accordance with their needs. The Legislature does not make appropriations to the individual institutions, though the total amount appropriated for higher education to the central board is based on estimates and recommendations showing the estimated needs of each institution.

Plan No. 5 provides a single State board for coordination only, with a strong professional executive, and with each individual institution having its own board for the complete control of its operations, but with the Legislature making its appropriations directly to each individual institution, based on recommendations received from the central coordinating board. This plan has developed relatively recently, the first example being in New Mexico, where it was introduced in 1951. In New Mexico the central coordinating agency is known as the Board of Educational Finance. Its members are appointed by the Governor from designated geographical areas of the State. The chief executive officer of the Board must, be statute, be a professional educator of nationally recognized competence in the finance and administration of higher education. The New Mexico statute refers to the executive officer of the Board of Educational Finance as "executive secretary" but the Board itself has designated the title as "chancellor." Other States that have more recently adopted a plan similar, except for certain details, to that in New Mexico are North Carolina, Texas, and Virginia. The Texas plan, for example, designates the coordinating board as the Texas Commission on Higher Education, and provides also an advisory committee for the Commission, consisting of one representative from each of the State institutions of higher education (currently numbering eighteen) and one from each system of higher education in the State having an executive officer, the members of the advisory committee being appointed by the governing boards of the respective institutions.

Plan No. 6 provides for a coordinating agency that represents the institutional boards that have operating control. The two examples of this pattern are California and Wisconsin. In each of these States there are just two boards with operating controls, each board having several institutional centers under its jurisdiction. In each case one of the boards controls the university system, which operates on more than one campus, and the other board controls the State college system, consisting of the institutions that were originally normal schools or teachers colleges. In both Wisconsin and California the coordinating agency has a relatively limited staff, drawn from personnel of the institutions or agencies in the system. The experience of California with this system is much longer than that of Wisconsin, where it was introduced only within the past two or three years.

Plan No. 7 consists of a voluntary agreement among all the State institutions of higher education to coordinate their activities and to present a unified budget to the Legislature. Such a plan is in effect in Indiana, Ohio, and Colorado. In Ohio the plan operates without any central staff, other than such incidental attention as may be given to the work by the presidents of the institutions or by a full-time staff member of one of them. In both Colorado and Indiana one or more members of the staff of certain of the institutions are definitely assigned to spend time on the assembling and analyzing of data for the consideration of the presidents and the Legislature. The voluntary coordination, as represented by plans in Ohio, Indiana, and Colorado, imposes no authority over the individual institutions, except as each may choose to abide by decisions that seem for the good of all.

Plan No. 8 consists of a grouping of a part of the institutions under a single board for purposes of control and coordination. In general, such plans provide little or no central professional staff for the single board. Most often it is the institutions that were formerly normal schools or teachers colleges that are grouped under this single board. The other institutions in the system, such as the land-grant college or the State university, have their own independent boards for control. Coordination over the entire system is exercised only through the Legislature. This is the plan at present followed in Michigan, and in Alabama, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, and a number of other States.

Plan No. 9, the final one, might be said to consist of complete absence of any evidence of coordination, each institution having its own individual board and each making its own approach for supporting funds directly to the Legislature. Arkansas is one of the few States still operating under such a plan.

No attempt has been made in this study to review the plan operating in every State, for all of them more or less fall into one of the nine categories that have been described in this chapter. Dr. Glenny's forthcoming study will doubtless provide detailed descriptions of all of them. In a number of States consideration is being given to the introduction of new plans for the coordination of the program of higher education. Louisiana is an example of a State in which the Legislature has recently had under consideration a new plan of coordination.

In general, the direction of development over the past thirty years in the United States has been toward the creation of strong central coordinating agencies for higher education at the State level. Most of the earlier developments in this period also provided for the centralization of operating controls over the individual institutions in a single board. The more recent plans have not been in this direction, but have provided only for a central coordinating agency, with operating controls left largely in the hands of local boards for each institution. There has been a general movement toward the strengthening of the executive office of the central coordinating agency, for it is becoming increasingly clear that the successful operation of a State-wide coordinating agency requires the services of a highly competent, professionally prepared executive officer, supplemented by an adequate research and clerical staff.

Although the discussion in this chapter has classified the State plans for coordination of higher education under nine different categories, actually there are small differences in the pattern among most of the States in any one of the categories. Very wisely the States, in setting up their plans, have adapted them to their own particular circumstances. No two States are exactly alike, and it would not be wise to pick a plan that is in effect in one or more other States and attempt to apply it in every detail to Michigan. Michigan has its own unique educational history, its own existing pattern of institutions, its own political traditions and practices, and its own unique geography and distribution of population. In many other ways Michigan differs from every other State, so needed improvements in the coordination and control of its system of higher education should not be effected by bodily lifting a plan that seems successful in Oregon or New Mexico or Texas or Oklahoma or any other State. Elements of the various plans that may seem desirable in Michigan may be selected, but they will probably need to be put together into a somewhat distinctive configuration to meet the situation in Michigan successfully.

CHAPTER V

A PLAN FOR THE COORDINATION OF STATE-CONTROLLED HIGHER EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN

The Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, under whose authority the present Survey is being conducted, was established by Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 30 of the 1955 Legislature. This Resolution specifically instructed the Committee to give attention to "the most desirable means for achieving effective and coordinated effort on the part of institutions in meeting present and future needs" in higher education. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the Survey to make recommendations for a plan, suitable to the needs of the State, for the coordination of State-controlled higher education in Michigan.

Anyone who has observed the relations between the Michigan institutions of higher education and the Legislature during recent legislative sessions cannot fail to be impressed by the need for such coordination. It is very clear that the Legislature and its committees have no very good way of estimating either the total needs of the State for higher education or the needs of the individual institutions for support. This is not a criticism of the Legislature or its committees, for they have done remarkably well, considering the limited data and analyses available upon which to make determinations of appropriations and other matters affecting the institutions.

An adequate plan of coordination would serve to clear up much of the present confusion in legislative consideration of matters affecting higher education. A coordinating agency should be able to develop procedures that will furnish a sound basis upon which the Legislature and its committees can deal equitably with the institutions in providing appropriations commensurate with the needs of each, within the limits of the available funds.

During the two years in which the present Survey of Higher Education in Michigan has been in progress, the Director of the Survey has visited every section of the State and has talked with the leaders in almost all the institutions, both publicly and privately controlled, as well as with other citizens who are interested in higher education but have no active connection with an institution. Almost all those interviewed had the opinion that Michigan needs a plan for the coordination of its State-controlled program of higher education. There are different ideas as to what sort of a plan would be suitable, but little or no disagreement was found with the basic conclusion that some plan for improved coordination should be introduced.

In the preceding chapters of the present report, some of the arguments have been given that support the necessity for an effective system of State-wide coordination. These arguments need not be repeated here. Instead the purpose of this chapter is to outline a plan that seems to the Director of the Survey a feasible solution to the problem in Michigan. The plan is based on the principles that have already been outlined, on a knowledge of the plans for coordination in many other States, on first-hand experience for some six years as the executive officer of the coordinating board for higher education in New Mexico, and on considerable intensive study of the situation in Michigan.

The attempt in this chapter is to develop a plan that will be tailor-made to fit the Michigan situation. No attempt is made to lift in toto the plan followed in some other State and to say this is just what Michigan needs. Instead, as indicated in the preceding chapter, the attempt is to adapt to the Michigan situation elements of plans and experience that have proved successful elsewhere. The Director of the Survey, as an outsider, cannot be familiar with every detail of the situation in Michigan, and there may be some elements of the suggested plan that those, more familiar than he is with the State, will deem it desirable to change.

Certain elements of the plan that are presented as recommendations in this chapter are not absolutely essential to a successful coordinating agency. They are suggested rather as steps that would improve the service of higher education in Michigan, and that could well be taken at the same time as the introduction of a plan of coordination.

A Separate Board for Each Institution

Preceding chapters of this report have discussed the wisdom of having a separate board for the operating control of each individual institution. The only part of the Michigan system of State-controlled higher education that does not now have a separate board for each institution consists of the four institutions, now under the State Board of Education, that were formerly normal schools -- Central Michigan College, Eastern Michigan College, Northern Michigan College, and Western Michigan University. The disadvantages of the arrangement for these four large, growing, and increasingly complex institutions to be under the control of the State Board of Education, with its possible rapid turnover of membership, and with its preoccupation with an immense range of responsibilities in the management of the public school system, have already been discussed in a preceding chapter.

It is recommended that steps be taken at once to create a separate board for the control of each of the four institutions now under the State Board of Education -- Central Michigan College, Eastern Michigan College, Northern Michigan College, and Western Michigan University. This step may be impossible without a revision of the State Constitution, for Article XI Section 6 states that "The state board of education shall have general supervision of the state normal college and the state normal schools, and the duties of said board shall be prescribed by law." It is possible, however, that legal opinion might be obtained to the effect that, inasmuch as the State no longer has any "normal college" or "normal schools," the institutions that are now State Colleges (and in one case a State University) are no longer under the provisions of Article XI Section 6 of the Constitution, insofar as the requirement is concerned that they shall be under the "supervision" of the State Board of Education. If this point of view is supported by good legal opinion, the way would be open for the Legislature to recognize the situation and to provide an individual Board for each of the institutions, provided the Legislature considers this a sound direction in which to move.

Even if it be held that the four institutions in question, though no longer a "normal college" or "normal schools," are still bound by the Constitution to be under the "supervision" of the State Board of Education, the language of Article XI Section 6 might still permit the Legislature to take action putting each of the institutions under a separate board for purposes of control. The wording of the Constitution, as previously quoted, clearly assigns to the State Board of Education only the "general supervision" of the institutions, and it also reserves to the legislature the responsibility of prescribing the duties of the State Board of Education. It would thus seem possible for the Legislature to define what is meant by "general supervision," describing it perhaps in purely nominal terms of submitting required reports annually, and to relieve the State Board of Education of other control functions over the four institutions, and to assign such functions to a board for each institution that is created for the purpose.

If it does not appear possible to provide by statute for the establishment of separate boards of control for each of the four institutions now under the State Board of Education, a change in the Constitution will be necessary to accomplish the step that is recommended. This step should be given careful consideration if and when a convention is called for a general revision of the State Constitution. If a convention is not to be called for a revision of the Constitution, procedures for an amendment to the Constitution should be initiated as soon as it is determined that the necessary steps for the establishment of the separate boards cannot be taken by statute.

Some suggestions may be offered about the nature of each of the boards that should be set up for the control of the four institutions now under the State Board of Education. The number of members on each of these boards should be not less than five nor more than nine. The members of each board should serve for relatively long terms, with expiration dates staggered so that a majority of the members will always have had at least two years of service. The length of term should be at least six years; if the number of members is six or more, the terms might be of the same length as the number of members, so that one term would expire each year. As an alternative, the terms of two members might expire every two years.

The Director of the Survey would suggest that the provision be made for the members of each of the new boards to be appointed by the Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as is the provision at present for certain of the institutional boards in Michigan. If it seems preferable to the Legislature and others close to the situation in the State, the members of the new board might be elected at the State-wide election in the spring, according to the present provision for certain of the other institutional boards in Michigan.

The legislation setting up the boards should provide that each member should serve until his successor is legally appointed (or elected) and qualified. A vacancy arising from the death, resignation, or disqualification of a board member, if occurring while an appointment is possible during the legislative session, should be filled for the remainder of the unexpired term by the usual process of appointment. If the vacancy occurs in the interim between legislative sessions, the board should be authorized to fill the position immediately on an interim basis by the appointment of a member selected by the remaining members of the board. Such an interim board member should serve only until an official appointment is made by the Governor and the Legislature at a subsequent session. If for any reason the appointing authority fails to appoint a successor to a board member whose term expires, he should continue to serve, and should be considered as having been officially confirmed for another complete term if during two consecutive sessions of the Legislature there is failure to appoint and confirm his successor.

In general, there should be no geographical limitations on board membership set up in the statute. It is probable that the Governor, in recommending persons for appointment to the boards, will take geographical factors into account, and it is likely that each of the four institutions in question will have board members drawn chiefly from its region of the State, but each board member should consider himself as representing the State as a whole, not any local geographical area, in discharging his responsibilities for the control of the institution.

The recommendation for the creation of separate boards for each of the four institutions now under the control of the State Board of Education is not essential to the plan of coordination that is to be presented. It is suggested, however, as a concomitant step in the interest of getting the best possible development of these four important institutions in Michigan's system of higher education.

Constitutional Boards for All Institutions

Reference has previously been made to the fact that two of Michigan's outstanding institutions of higher education have boards that are set up in the State Constitution with a large measure of autonomy. It is recommended that, if and when a convention is called for a general revision of the State Constitution, each and every board for a State-controlled institution of higher education be given the same kind of constitutional authority and responsibility for management and control of their respective institutions that the Constitution now extends to the boards for the University of Michigan and Michigan State University. There should be no change in the constitutional status of the boards for the University of Michigan and Michigan State University.

The present constitutional provisions for the boards of the University of Michigan and Michigan State University have been associated with the development of exceptionally strong, effective, and nationally, even internationally, distinguished institutions. If the people of Michigan want their other institutions also to be strong and effective on a continuing basis in the future, it would be wise to extend the same sort of constitutional status to the boards of these other institutions. This step is not essential to the establishment of a coordinating organization, but the recommendation is made in the interest of the best possible development of higher education in Michigan.

Creation of a Coordinating Board

It is recommended that the Legislature take immediate steps to create and establish a board for the coordination of the State-controlled program of higher education in Michigan. This board might have some such designation as "Michigan Board for Higher Education." In the ensuing discussion it will be referred to simply as the "Coordinating Board." There would seem to be no barrier to the setting up of this board immediately by statute, if the Legislature wishes. After some experience has been had with its operation, so that details of the necessary provisions have been agreed upon, it might prove desirable to provide constitutional status for the Coordinating Board. If a general revision of the Constitution is undertaken before experience can be had in Michigan with the organization and procedure of a Coordinating Board, it might be well to consider the recognition of such a Board in the revised Constitution, but the reference should be in very general terms, avoiding too many details that later might prove to be unwise as further experience is had with the operations of the Board.

Functions of the Coordinating Board

In order that the Coordinating Board might be guided properly by the Legislature in carrying out its responsibilities, it would be well for the statute creating it to be specific about the functions of the Board. Any constitutional provision for a Coordinating Board should not be specific about such details. The Legislature can amend the statute from time to time, to adjust the functions to conditions as experience warrants.

One of the important functions of the Coordinating Board would be the collection, analysis, and reporting of data concerning the programs, facilities, finances, and operations of all the State-controlled institutions of higher education. The Coordinating Board should be the agency through which the Legislature and all other State agencies are furnished whatever information they need about the institutions of higher education. The statute creating the Coordinating Board should give it specific authority to collect all data that it deems pertinent to an understanding of State-controlled higher education in Michigan. In order to insure full co-operation by the institutions in the furnishing of requested data, the Legislature might make the release of appropriated funds to each institution conditional upon the certification by the Coordinating Board that all requested information has been furnished it by the institution. Such a provision should be attached to the annual appropriation act, rather than to the statute creating the Coordinating Board.

A second function of the Coordinating Board would be to furnish the State fiscal authorities and the Legislature an annual estimate of the needs of each State-controlled institution for appropriations for the coming fiscal year. These estimates should include capital outlay needs as well as needs for funds for current operations. The report made to the Legislature should show both the amount that the individual institution is requesting (along with the justification for that request) and the amount the Coordinating Board recommends as an appropriation. The amounts recommended by the Coordinating Board should be based on the best possible effort to give equal treatment to the needs of each institution, within the limits of what the Coordinating Board considers the condition of the State's finances can probably provide. The State fiscal authorities and the Legislature should expect to follow the advice of the coordinating agency in appropriating funds to the individual institutions. If the full amount of the grand total requested cannot be provided, the Legislature should divide the available funds according to a reconsidered recommendation of the Coordinating Board.

A third function of the Coordinating Board would be to advise the Legislature and other agencies of State government on all policy matters affecting the development and operation of higher education in the State. Examples of matters on which the Legislature should not act until it has had the advice of the Coordinating Board are: (1) the establishment of a new State institution of higher education; (2) the development of a significant new area of service, such as a medical school, or a branch center, at an existing institution; (3) policies about the amount of tuition fees, the admission of out-of-State students, self-financing plant developments, and similar problems.

A fourth function of the Coordinating Board would be to make continuing studies of the State's needs for higher education, and of the effectiveness of the programs presently maintained by the institutions. Reports of such studies should receive wide circulation. Many of them will be of direct interest to the members of the Legislature. All of them should be of great interest to the officials of each of the institutions. The feeding back into the institutions of well organized and analyzed data on the programs of all the institutions is one of the important methods by which a non-coercive type of coordination can be introduced and maintained. Over a period of years it may be expected that the public in general will be interested in the reports of studies made by the Coordinating Board. The newspapers, sensing the interest of their readers, will be alert to give wide publicity to findings and recommendations resulting from the continual study and restudy of the program of higher education in the State.

A fifth function of the Coordinating Board would be to provide a source, through its staff, from which the officials of the institutions in the State could obtain wise advice and counsel on the problems of developing and operating their programs. This again is a non-coercive type of coordination, and the institutions would be under no direct compulsion to accept the advice given them, except as it appeals to them as being sound. But the availability of a competent staff from which such advice could be obtained would be of great advantage to most of the institutions in the State.

Finally, the Coordinating Board should be given authority to make such test checks and audits of institutional records as it deems necessary to insure the accuracy and uniformity of the reports that are made to it. The Legislature and the other State agencies with which the Coordinating Board will deal must have complete confidence in the Board's reports. In turn, the Board must make certain that data are being reported to it in a uniform pattern and on a trustworthy basis, with each institutional official who prepares reports having a clear understanding of what is wanted. Frequent conferences with the reporting officials in the institutions, such as business managers and registrars will be essential to the maintenance of uniformity in the reporting process.

The Coordinating Board should be given no authority whatever to interfere with the internal administration of any of the State-controlled institutions. Such matters as the employment of personnel for service in the institutions, requirements for degrees, the admission and retention of students, and all similar matters of internal management should be left completely to the authorities of the various institutions. Major program developments, requiring special financing, should be a matter for consideration in the annual budget requests of the institutions for appropriations, and the Coordinating Board should make recommendations to the Legislature and the State fiscal authorities with regard to the desirability of appropriations for such developments and the amounts of funds needed for them. Each institution, however, should have complete authority for the disposition of such funds as are appropriated to it, subject only to the furnishing of an annual operating budget to the Coordinating Board and the appropriate State fiscal authorities. The operating budgets are essential to an effective consideration of each institution's requests for appropriations for the following year. Each institution should be free to revise its current operating budget as frequently as it deems necessary during the year, subject only to notification to the Coordinating Board.

The Legislature might well give consideration to the transfer to the Coordinating Board of the authority, at present assigned to the State Board of Education, for the incorporation and inspection of non-profit educational institutions. As was pointed out in the Preliminary Report to the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education,[1] pages 16-18, the State Board of Education has not been furnished sufficient funds or staff to carry out its assigned responsibilities under the statute (C.L. 450.170-177). Perhaps the responsibility for passing on the applications of groups for the establishment of privately controlled institutions of higher education, and the regular inspection of such institutions, as required by the statute, would be more compatible with the other duties of the Coordinating Board than with the general duties of the State Board of Education.

Any legislation that is adopted in setting up the Coordinating Board should carry the provision that it should perform such other functions as the Legislature may from time to time determine.

---

[1] John Dale Russell, Preliminary Report to the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education. Prepared for the Michigan Legislative Study Committee on Higher Education, State Capitol, Lansing, Michigan. March, 1957.

Membership of the Coordinating Board

The Coordinating Board should have a membership of not less than five nor more than nine. The members should serve for relatively long terms, not less than six years, and there should be no barrier to reappointment of members for successive terms. The expiration of terms should be staggered, so that a majority of the members will always have had at least two years of service on the Coordinating Board. If there are six or more members on the Coordinating Board, the terms might be the same number of years as the number of members, so that one term will expire each year. An alternative arrangement would be to have two terms expire every second year.

Appointment of members to the Coordinating Board should be a joint responsibility of the Governor and the Legislature, with some of the members being appointed by each agency. The purpose of this arrangement is to enable the Coordinating Board to represent in its membership both the legislative and the executive branches of the State Government. If a Coordinating Board of eight members be assumed, two could be appointed by the Senate, two by the House of Representatives, and four by the Governor. The appointments by the Legislature would normally be from the membership of the House and the Senate, respectively, but an appointee who, during his term on the Coordinating Board, ceases to be a member of the Legislature, should not thereby be disqualified from continuing to hold his membership on the Coordinating Board. The important feature is to get some members on the Coordinating Board who have had recent experience as members of the Legislature. As a matter of procedure, it would appear well for the appointments by the Legislature to be made first. The Governor's appointments could then be made in such a way as to get a suitable balance and distribution in the membership of the Coordinating Board.

Consideration should be given to the need for and desirability of an explicit provision that the Coordinating Board must be bi-partisan. This could be done by specifying that no more than a definite number of the members could belong to one political party at the time of their appointment. The Director of the Survey would not recommend such a provision, but others who know the Michigan situation intimately may think such a provision would be wise. In any event, the Coordinating Board would always be expected to act in a non-partisan manner. Its decisions should not be reached in terms of the principles and policies and platforms of the political parties. In most States this goal would be best achieved by making no provision whatever concerning the party affiliations of Board members.

The legislation should prohibit the appointment of any person to the Coordinating Board who is on the salaried staff or the controlling board of any State-controlled institution of higher education in Michigan. The Coordinating Board should act on all matters from a completely neutral point of view with respect to the individual institutions in the State System. Such a point of view cannot be expected in one who has a close connection with a State-controlled college or university. In one of the other States in which a Coordinating Board has been set up in recent years, the statute provides that no member of the Board may be a resident of any county in which a State-controlled institution is located. Such a restriction is not recommended for Michigan, for it would eliminate too much territory in which men and women well qualified for Board membership reside. Consideration might be given to a provision that not more than one Board member may reside in a county in which an operating unit of a State-controlled institution of higher education is located. Suggestion has also been made that the number of alumni of any one institution who are on the Coordinating Board should be definitely limited. In the experience of the Director of the Survey, this would not seem to be a necessary provision; sometimes an alumnus may be very critical of the institution which he attended and may not display a bias or partisan spirit toward it.

It would seem well to provide for some sort of geographical distribution of the membership of the Coordinating Board. The suggestion made in a preceding paragraph, for a limitation of only one member from any county having an operating unit of a State-controlled institution of higher education in it, would result in some geographical distribution of the Board membership. If members are to be designated from specific geographical areas, as is done in some of the State coordinating agencies (for example, New Mexico), it would be difficult in Michigan to get a proper balance between the sparsely populated counties and the metropolitan regions. For example, in any scheme of geographical distribution one would almost surely specify at least one member from the Upper Peninsula. Yet, on the basis of population, the Upper Peninsula would not be entitled to one member unless there was a total membership of more than twenty on the Board, inasmuch as the Upper Peninsula has only 4.5 per cent of the State's total population. Under any scheme of geographical distribution it will be difficult to give full representative to the heavily populated southeastern region of Michigan. The method of obtaining a suitable geographical representation in the membership of the Coordinating Board is a problem on which members of the Legislature and leading citizens of the State will undoubtedly have better judgment than someone from outside the State, such as the Director of the Survey.

The legislation creating the Coordinating Board should specify clearly the causes for removal or disqualification of a member of the Board, and the process by which removal is to be accomplished should also be spelled out. Affiliation with a State-controlled institution of higher education, as a board member or member of the salaried staff, should be an immediate cause for disqualification of a member of the Coordinating Board. Conviction of a felony, loss of citizenship, removal from the State, and similar circumstances should disqualify a member of the Coordinating Board. A member of the Coordinating Board should not be disqualified during the remainder of his term if he changes his residence within the State from the area from which he was originally appointed, or if he was a legislative appointee and ceases to be a member of the Legislature. The statute should be drawn so as to prevent the removal of members of the Coordinating Board at the pleasure of the appointing authority.

Members of the Coordinating Board should serve until their successors are legally appointed and qualified. A vacancy arising from death, resignation, or disqualification of a Board member should be filled immediately by the proper appointing authority. Such an appointee should serve until the normal expiration of the term of the member he succeeds. In case such a vacancy is not filled promptly by the proper appointing authority, the Board itself should have power to appoint an interim Board member; if an appointment is not made by the proper appointing authority within a specified time, such as one year after the vacancy occurs, the appointment made by the Board itself should become permanent for the remainder of the unexpired term. If for any reason the appointing authority fails to appoint a successor to a member of the Coordinating Board whose term expires, within a reasonable period, such as one year after the expiration of that term, that Board member should automatically succeed himself for another full term.

Members of the Coordinating Board should be paid a modest per diem for each day actually spent in the service of the Board (except those who are in a salaried position in other State service) plus mileage and travel expenses. The amount of the per diem should be such as is customary for similar boards in Michigan.

Service on the Coordinating Board will require substantial time and attention from its members. The Board will need to meet at least quarterly, and probably monthly during the first few years while it is working out its initial pattern of policies and procedures. The members of the Board will need to be prepared to review and study critically a considerable volume of statistical material and other information, furnished by the staff, which will enable the Board to make wise decisions. The Board should not become a rubber stamp for the approval of all recommendations put before it by its executive staff, but instead should study and thoroughly understand every recommendation before adopting it. Only persons who expect to devote sufficient time to the responsibilities should be appointed to the Coordinating Board. Those who do serve effectively on the Board, however, will find it a rewarding experience, for they will come to be among the best informed citizens of the State about the problems of higher education in general and about the operations of the Michigan institutions in particular.

Staff for the Coordinating Board

The key to the successful operation of the Coordinating Board will lie in its ability to attract and retain a highly competent staff. The legislation should provide that the Coordinating Board shall have an adequate executive staff, and should explicitly require the Board to employ a chief executive officer with outstanding competence in the field of higher education. The salary of the chief executive officer of the Board should be comparable to those paid the Presidents of the major State universities. The statute should also provide for the appointment by the Board of such other members of the executive and clerical staff as are needed and are recommended by the chief executive officer.

The title to be given the Board's chief executive officer is a matter of some importance. It must be such as to give him prestige among educational leaders within the State and throughout the entire country and among the other governmental officials in the State with whom he must work closely and cooperatively. The Director of the Survey would suggest that the title be "Chancellor," inasmuch as this title is now in use in some States for an official with similar responsibilities. The title "Chancellor" is not in use in Michigan for any other position, so it would assist in avoiding confusion if the chief executive officer of the Board is designated with some such distinctive title.

Again, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that every effort must be made to attract and retain a highly competent person as the chief executive officer of the Coordinating Board, and also to maintain personnel with a high level of competence in all the other positions on the Board's staff. The Coordinating Board will be of no service to the State unless it has a staff that can command the respect and confidence of the officials of the institutions, the State fiscal authorities, the members of the Legislature, and the group of professional people in higher education throughout the entire country. Decisions related to the coordination of a State-wide program of higher education cannot be made by formula, but require the exercise of the highest level of professional competence. The chief executive officer of the Board must not only have a thorough knowledge of the field of higher education, but he must also be a person of demonstrated intellectual integrity, and with the moral courage to stand by principles, policies, and decisions that are right even though they may, for the moment, be unpopular.

Financing the Coordinating Board

The financing of the operations of the Coordinating Board should be in accordance with an annual budget approved by the Board and by the Legislature. The support of the Board's activities, however, must be on some sort of a permanent and continuing basis, so that its operations and policies are not subject to violent fluctuations from year to year. For that reason it is suggested that the legislation establishing the Coordinating Board should provide for its support by an annual assessment against each of the State-controlled institutions of higher education, in proportion to the amount of the appropriation made to each institution by the Legislature. This is the financing plan that is followed in New Mexico and has worked successfully there. If the arrangement would be unconstitutional in the case of the University of Michigan and Michigan State University, it may be necessary for the Legislature to make direct appropriation to the Coordinating Board for that portion of its budgetary support.

The total amount of the budget for the support of the Coordinating Board should be determined finally by the Legislature, as suggested in the preceding paragraph. It is suggested further that, to protect the Board's operations against an ill-considered or hasty action (or possible inaction) in some future session of the Legislature, the statute should provide that the budget submitted to the Legislature by the Coordinating Board shall be considered to be approved unless and until the Legislature takes specific action to change it.

Under present conditions it is estimated that the cost of operating the Coordinating Board would range between $100,000 and $150,000 annually, with the probability that it would average about $125,000 after the first year of operation. In the initial setting up of the Board's office the first year, there would be an initial expense for equipment that would not recur in subsequent years. The estimated total annual expenditure, as indicated above, has been derived from detailed budget calculations that provide for such items as the salaries of the chief executive officer, his major assistant or deputy, a secretary and office manager, research clerks and clerk-typists, a substantial amount of IBM tabulating service, travel by the staff, expense of the Coordinating Board members, office supplies, postage, telephone and telegraph, and similar services, office equipment and its servicing, and a reasonable amount of printing and duplicating service.

The actual costs of the Board's operations would be influenced materially by the kind and extent of cooperation exhibited by the State institutions of higher education. If the institutions are able to furnish required reports promptly and completely and in good order, the expenses of the Board's office can be kept to a minimum. Inasmuch as the support of the Board's operations would really be a tax on the appropriations made to each institution, it is to the advantage of the institutions to keep the costs of the Board's operations low by means of the highest possible level of cooperation.

Quarters for the office of the Coordinating Board should be provided in the capital city of Lansing. The location of the offices should be such as to facilitate easy contact and communication with the State fiscal authorities, the State Department of Public Instruction, and the Legislature. The headquarters of the Coordinating Board should provide a comfortable and commodious office for the chief executive officer, a smaller office for his assistant or deputy, a conference room adequate for meetings of the Board and other groups, and one or more workrooms sufficient to house the activities of a staff of perhaps a dozen clerks and research personnel.

State Control over Community Colleges

In addition to the problems of the control and coordination of the State's program of higher education, as maintained in degree-granting colleges and universities, there is a problem in Michigan with respect to the central control over the system of community colleges. As has been pointed out in an earlier chapter of this report, at present there is no central State agency to which responsibility is assigned for continuing supervision and control of the community colleges in Michigan, other than the general responsibility for the oversight of the public school systems in the State that is a function of the State Board of Education. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction is responsible for the initial approval of the establishment of a community college, but he and his staff have not been assigned responsibility for continuing supervision of these institutions. One member of the staff does spend some time in an advisory capacity with the community colleges, and with local groups in a city or county where a new community college is being considered or planned. State support is provided the community colleges on the basis of a flat amount per student in attendance, a procedure that is sufficiently simple so that a clerk can operate it, but which lacks the very essential characteristic of equalizing the support among the communities of varying abilities. The Legislature has also provided appropriations for capital outlay in the community colleges, and these funds are distributed to the various institutions by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction up to 50 per cent of the total cost of specific projects. The Legislature is not provided a detailed budget for these capital outlay programs, so that it might know what projects are included to make up the total amount requested. The amount of the appropriation is so far below the needs of these institutions for capital outlay purposes that the present procedure could not possibly involve any waste of public funds, but at the same time it is not an exemplary method of requesting and receiving funds from the Legislature.

The present arrangement, for what might be described as a sort of hit-or-miss control over the community colleges at the State level, has worked reasonably well as long as the institutions were few in number and enrolled only a very small fraction of the total college students of the State. But the community colleges are today the most rapidly growing segment of higher education in Michigan. Their enrollments are increasing at more than double the average rate for the entire State. New institutions of this sort are being established every year, and many more will doubtless be established in the years that lie immediately ahead. The time has come when some definite arrangements should be set up for the continuing supervision of the entire community college system by an appropriate agency of State government in Michigan.

As a matter of general principle, it would seem wise for the State to lodge the authority over the community college system in a board rather than in some individual official of State Government. This would be in accord with the general pattern of control at the State and local levels for all other educational operations. Assignment of the responsibility to a board provides for a broad representation of the public interest in the operations and services of the institutions, and helps to prevent the creation of a bureaucratic form of control. There would seem to be at least three possibilities for the assignment of responsibility for supervision at the State level over the community college system in Michigan.

One possibility would be to lodge the responsibility in the present State Board of Education. This would have the advantage of tying in the function with the other functions of supervision over the public school system at present exercised by the State Board of Education. It would also avoid the creation of a new State agency. The Director of the Survey would not favor such a solution to the problem. In the first place, the State Board of Education now has all the responsibility it can carry in the control and supervision over the public school system at the elementary and secondary school levels. In the second place, a board of four members is probably too small to give adequate representation to the broad public interest in community college problems. In the third place, the State Board of Education, as at present constituted, is subject to rapid changes in its membership; on two occasions in the past five years half the members of the Board have been completely new to their positions, a situation which is contrary to good management and control for an institution of higher education. In the fourth place, it is coming to be recognized that the community college is something different from the other units of the public school system. It is not just a glorified high school, neither is it just an inferior or down-graded college. It has a distinct and unique place of its own in the public school system. As such, it probably deserves the kind of supervision at the State level that can best be furnished by an agency which does not have its main focus of attention on the elementary and secondary schools.

Another possibility would be to lodge responsibility for general supervision of the community colleges in the Coordinating Board, whose establishment has been recommended earlier in this chapter. There would be a certain logic to this, because the Coordinating Board will be concerned with educational programs in the State-controlled institutions that, to a considerable extent, are parallel to those in the community colleges. There would be several disadvantages in such an arrangement. The Coordinating Board will have its hands full with the problems of the State-controlled institutions, and probably should not be burdened with any further major responsibilities for other kinds of units in the educational system, at least in the early years of its operation. Furthermore, the Coordinating Board must steadfastly resist the temptation to get into the operating controls of the institutions. But if it is assigned supervision over the community colleges, which would be a different sort of responsibility from that which it has for the State-controlled institutions, the Coordinating Board might become accustomed to dealing in terms of controls rather than coordination, and this would be disastrous or at least hazardous to its operations with the State-controlled institutions.

A third possibility would be to create a new State board, possibly known as the Community College Board, and to assign to it all the functions which the State should exercise in the supervision and control of community colleges. Such a board would have responsibility for laying out broad, State-wide plans for the centers where community colleges should be developed, for approving the establishment of each new community college, for regulation and inspection to assure that the community colleges are maintaining programs of good quality, for the collection of necessary statistical data, for supervising the financing of the community colleges insofar as State funds are involved, and for recommending to the proper State authorities an annual budget in support of appropriations requested from State funds for current operations and capital outlay projects in the community colleges. The Community College Board should have its own staff to assist it in carrying out its functions.

It is recommended that the Legislature provide for the creation of a Community College Board to exercise the necessary State-level supervision over the community college program in Michigan. Whether this alternative or some other is chosen as a means of meeting the problem of central State supervision over the community colleges, the agency designated for this purpose should be provided with appropriations sufficient for it to exercise its important functions.

There is a special problem with respect to the coordination of the State's support of community colleges with its support of the State-controlled, degree-granting institutions. These two segments of the State's efforts in higher education ought not be competing with one another for appropriations from the Legislature.

It is recommended that the agency, to which central State authority over the community college system is assigned, prepare an annual budget request for appropriations for the current support and capital outlay needs of the entire system of community colleges; and that this budget request be submitted to and reviewed by the Coordinating Board, in the same manner as the budget requests for appropriations for each of the State-controlled, degree-granting institutions are reviewed; and that the Coordinating Board be responsible for recommending to the State fiscal authorities and to the Legislature the total amount to be appropriated from State funds for current support and capital outlay projects in the community college system. By this procedure the State fiscal authorities and the Legislature may have competent advice concerning the relative needs for supporting funds in the various units of the State-wide program of higher education. It seems entirely probable that, by this procedure, the State could get away from the present inequitable method of providing support to the individual community colleges in terms of a flat amount per student in attendance, and could instead supply funds to each community college in accordance with its individual needs and its ability to obtain funds from other sources.

Supervision and Accreditation of High Schools

The final problem to be discussed concerning the coordination and control of the State's program of higher education is a small one, and it is also marginal to the field of higher education. At present the responsibility for supervising and accrediting the high schools in Michigan is assigned to the University of Michigan. In every other State this is a function of the State board of education or the State department of public instruction. The condition in Michigan is a vestigial remnant of an older situation in which all the high schools were originally considered to be "branches" of the University of Michigan. This was perhaps a tenable point of view when the sole function of the high schools was preparation for college, but the modern program of secondary education has moved far away from this attitude, and attempts to provide suitable instruction for all young people of the appropriate ages, whether they are going to college or not. Many other States, like Michigan, originally lodged responsibility for the supervision of high schools in the State university, but all of the States except Michigan have changed the assignment of this responsibility and have put it in the central educational agency of the State, where it seems most logically to belong.

The present arrangement in Michigan is objectionable from several points of view. In the first place, it loads on to the budget of the University of Michigan, and thus on to the total cost of operating the services of higher education in the State, the expenses of maintaining the supervisory and accrediting services for the high schools. This is not a legitimate expense of higher education, and is not so considered anywhere else in the United States. It is properly an expense of the public school system, and should be met from funds appropriated for that level of the educational system, rather than from funds appropriated for higher education.

The second objection to the present arrangement in Michigan is that it does not provide assurance that the supervision of the high schools will be operated from the broad point of view of the public interest in that level of education, rather than from the narrow point of view of preparation for college. As a matter of fact, there can be no criticism in this respect of the actual operation of the supervisory service from the University of Michigan, for those in charge of the service have in every way assisted in the development of broad programs in the public secondary schools of the State. Although the present practices in supervision as carried on by the University of Michigan are in accord with sound views about the function of secondary education, there is no assurance that a narrower point of view might not at some time be imposed.

In the third place, the State system of higher education should be relieved of the burden of bearing and answering criticisms that inevitably arise from those who are disgruntled about decisions made in the process of supervising and accrediting high schools. Such criticisms are certain to arise, for some people are bound to feel aggrieved at decisions that are made.

An excellent illustration of the point arose during the early months of 1957, when the North Central Association took action against one of the high schools in the State, and pressure was immediately exerted on the University of Michigan not to take similar action in suspending the accreditation of the school. The matter arose at a time, unfortunately, when the budget requests for appropriations of the State educational institutions were being considered by the Legislature. Some members of the Legislature took a great interest in the fate of the high school in question, and for a time it seemed as if the amount of the appropriation to be made to the University of Michigan might be influenced by the action of the University authorities on the accreditation of the high school. The University authorities did not, in this case, suspend the accreditation of the high school in question, though such suspension might normally have been expected. The whole fracas certainly added nothing to the dignity or stature of the University of Michigan, nor to that of the Michigan Legislature. The situation arose because of the inherent defect in the policy of assigning responsibilities to a unit of the State's system of higher education for the supervision and accreditation of high schools.

It is recommended that the Legislature transfer the function of the supervision and accreditation of high schools to the State Board of Education and the State Department of Public Instruction, with a corresponding transfer of the funds needed to operate this service. This recommendation is not an essential part of the plan for establishing a coordinating agency for higher education in Michigan, but is offered in the interest of improving the State's service in education by the allocation of functions to the agencies that can most properly be expected to exercise them.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

For the convenience of the reader, the various recommendations made in the preceding chapters of this report are brought together in summary form in this final chapter. The recommendations are stated succinctly, without supporting details or arguments. Reference is made at the end of each recommendation to the page in the text where the discussion supporting the recommendation will be found.

1. It is recommended that the Legislature take immediate steps to create and establish a board for the coordination of the State-controlled program of higher education in Michigan. (See page 68.)

2. It is recommended that the Legislature provide for the creation of a Community College Board to exercise the necessary State-level supervision over the community college program in Michigan. (See page 84.)

3. It is recommended that the agency, to which central State authority over the community college system is assigned, prepare an annual budget request for appropriations for the current support and capital outlay needs of the entire system of community colleges; and that this budget request be submitted to and reviewed by the Coordinating Board, in the same manner as the budget requests for appropriations for each of the State-controlled, degree-granting institutions are reviewed; and, that the Coordinating Board be responsible for recommending to the State fiscal authorities and to the Legislature the total amount to be appropriated from State funds for current support and capital outlay projects in the community college system. (See page 85.)

4. It is recommended that steps be taken at once to create a separate board for the control of each of the four institutions now under the State Board of Education -- Central Michigan College, Eastern Michigan College, Northern Michigan College, and Western Michigan University. (See page 64.)

5. It is recommended that, if and when a convention is called for a general revision of the State Constitution, each and every board for a State-controlled institution of higher education be given the same kind of constitutional authority and responsibility for management and control of their respective institutions that the Constitution now extends to the boards for the University of Michigan and Michigan State University. There should be no change in the constitutional status of the boards for the University of Michigan and Michigan State University. (See page 67.)

6. It is recommended that the statute providing for the Board of Control of Michigan College of Mining and Technology (C.L. 390.352) be amended by striking out the clause requiring four of the members to be residents of the Upper Peninsula. (See page 17.)

7. It is recommended that the statute governing Wayne State University (Public Acts of 1956, No. 183) be amended to provide that the chairman of the Board of Governors shall be elected from the membership of the Board and shall preside at meetings of the Board. (See page 19.)

8. It is recommended that, if and when a convention is called for a general revision of the State Constitution, consideration be given to revising the method of selecting board members for the State-controlled institutions so that all will be appointed by the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. (See page 9.)

9. It is recommended that, if and when a convention is called for a general revision of the State Constitution, consideration be given to the elimination of ex officio membership by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction on any board that controls any State college or university. (See page 10.)

10. It is recommended that, if and when a convention is called for a general revision of the State Constitution, consideration be given to the elimination of all provisions for ex officio non-voting members of the controlling boards of the institutions of higher education. (See page 11.)

11. It is recommended that, if and when a convention is called for a general revision of the State Constitution, consideration be given to the elimination of the provisions that the Presidents of the University of Michigan and Michigan State University shall be the presiding officers of their respective governing boards. (See page 19.)

12. It is recommended that the Legislature transfer the function of the supervision and accreditation of high schools to the State Board of Education and the State Department of Public Instruction, with a corresponding transfer of the funds needed to operate this service. (See page 88.)